

THE CHICAGO JEWISH FORUM

A Quarterly Magazine

VOLUME 3, No. 2

WINTER, 1944-45



Contents

THE NAZIS AND THE RIGHT OF ASYLUM	-	Kurt R. Grossman	85
AN AMERICAN DILEMMA	- - - -	Werner J. Cahnman	92
A BIZARRE FELLOWSHIP	- - - - -	Elmer Gertz	97
AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL— <i>A Poem</i>	- - - - -	A. M. Klein	102
PALESTINE AND POWER POLITICS	- - - -	Isacque Graeber	104
HISTORIC PEOPLES— <i>A Cartoon</i>	- - - -	Irving Kriesberg	110
MAKE THY FACE CLEAR BEFORE MINE EYES - (<i>A Short Story</i>)		Katherine Kornblau	111
PROUST AND THE DREYFUS CASE	- - - -	Harry Salpeter	116
THE RABBI— <i>A Poem</i>	- - - - -	Harold Applebaum	122
JOSEPH ALBO: THINKER AND PROPHET	- - - -	Jacob S. Minkin	123
LANDLESS PEOPLES— <i>A Cartoon</i>	- - - -	Irving Kriesberg	131
NEW YORK NOTES	- - - - -	Vero	132
BOOK REVIEWS	- - - - -		136

BENJAMIN WEINTROUB, *Editor and Publisher*

ALFRED WERNER, *Associate Editor*

WERNER J. CAHNMAN, *Contributing Editor*

THE CHICAGO JEWISH FORUM is published quarterly at 176 W. Adams St., Chicago 3, Ill. Copyright, 1943, in the U.S.A. by Benjamin Weintraub, Publisher. Entered as second-class matter Jan. 19, 1943, at the post-office at Chicago, Ill., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Unsolicited manuscripts will not be returned unless accompanied by stamped, self-addressed envelope. Subscription \$5.00 per year.

Contributors to this Issue

HAROLD APPLEBAUM—Has published poems in numerous periodicals throughout the country. He is now a sergeant in the Army.

FRITZ BAMBERGER—Is Director of Editorial Research of *Coronet Magazine*, and the author of numerous books and articles.

GEORGE BOBRINSKOY—Professor of Sanskrit and Indian Philosophy at the University of Chicago, has also during the war been in charge of the teaching of Russian in that institution.

BERNARD J. BROWN—A Chicago lawyer, is the author of *From Pharaoh to Hitler*.

WERNER J. CAHNMAN—Is an instructor in Economics and Sociology at Fisk University, and the author of many publications both in German and English.

ELMER GERTZ—Is President of the Chicago Lawyers' Guild and a contributor to various publications.

ISACQUE GRAEBER—Is author of the series *Jews in a Gentile World* and a contributor to the *New Republic* and the *New Statesman*.

KURT R. GROSSMAN—A prominent figure in the German pacifist movement before the war is co-author of a forthcoming book on the refugee problem.

O. GARFIELD JONES—Is Professor of Political Economy at Toledo University.

A. M. KLEIN—Is a leading Canadian poet and author of *Hath Not a Jew* and *The Hitleriad*.

KATHERINE KORNBLAU—Is a Chicagoan and a student at Northwestern University.

IRVING KRIESBERG—Painter of murals and exhibitor in the Art Institute, has recently returned from Mexico.

MARK KRUG—Is a contributor to various magazines and a former contributor to *THE FORUM*.

JACOB S. MINKIN—Is a writer for magazines and the author of *The Romance of Hasidism*.

DR. SAMUEL N. ROSENBLUM—Is a practising physician on the staffs of several hospitals and Medical Director of the Cook County Tuberculosis Hospital.

LIONEL RUBY—Is Assistant Professor of Philosophy at the University of Indiana (Calumet Center), at present on leave of absence in government service with the War Labor Board.

HARRY SALPETER—Is a writer, editor, and the author of articles on art and literary subjects.

ALFRED WERNER—Is Associate Editor of *THE CHICAGO JEWISH FORUM*.

HARVEY WISH—Is Professor of History at Smith College and the author of *George Fitzhugh, Propagandist of the Old South* and a forthcoming book on American history.

The Nazis and the Right of Asylum

By KURT R. GROSSMAN

AT A TIME when there is a definite certainty of the defeat of Germany, we are obliged to consider once again the punishment of the guilty ones. The horrible documents of Maidanek, published in the last days of August 1944, have proved to us vividly that it will be a crime against justice, against our children and their children, if we do not see to it that the shameful criminal acts of the Germans and their accomplices receive due punishment without indulgence and without possibilities of escape. Only then can we build a security with a solid foundation. Just punishment of the war criminals, both the leaders and the small fry, is one of the prerequisites to avoiding World War III. As stated by the *New York Times* in its excellent editorial of August 31, 1944, "In this hour of their tribulation, the Nazis would be glad indeed to bury all the millions of the innocent dead fallen at their hands, not only on the battlefields, but in prisons and in murder camps."

We should be aware of the fact that the beginning of these crimes was seen in 1918. In Germany itself, leaders of the political minority parties were murdered. Murder was a premeditated means of seizing the power of the state. Murder again was used by the Germans to make them the masters of the world. The Germans have no right whatsoever to appeal for the application of democratic principles. Robespierre, the whip of the French Revolution once said: "The Republic to the Republicans." We should have no other basic idea than that expressed in these words regarding the right of asylum. The Germans have no right to claim

asylum in order to escape their just punishment. History would lose its significance if those who were responsible for the extermination of millions of Jews, Poles, Greeks, Serbs, French, Belgians, Dutch, and Norwegians should be allowed to escape to a neutral country, claiming the sacred eternal right of asylum so as to escape retribution for their horrifying deeds. History would lose its significance if the perpetrators of these crimes—the officers, the camp leaders, the soldiers who executed the orders—should go unpunished.

It should be recalled that President Roosevelt, on July 31, 1943, declared:

When victory has been achieved it is the purpose of the government of the United States, as I know it is the purpose of each of the United Nations, to make appropriate use of the information and evidence in respect to the barbaric crimes of the invaders in Europe and Asia. It seems only fair that they should have this warning that the time will come when they shall have to stand in courts of law in the very countries which they are now oppressing and answer for their acts. On October 7, 1942, I stated that it was the intention of the Government that the successful close of the war shall include provisions for the surrender to the United Nations of war criminals. The wheels of justice have turned constantly since these statements were issued and are still turning. There are now rumours that Mussolini and members of his fascist gang may attempt to take refuge in neutral territory. One day Hitler and his gang and Tojo will be trying to escape from their countries. I find it difficult to believe that any neutral country would give asylum or extend protection to any of them. I can only say that the Government of the United States would regard the action by a neutral country in affording asylum to Axis leaders or their tools as inconsistent with the principles for which the United Nations are fighting and that the United States Government

hopes that no neutral government will permit its territory to be used as a place of refuge or otherwise assist such persons in any effort to escape their just deserts. [*New York Sun*, July 31, 1943.]

Switzerland seems to have already complied with this request of President Roosevelt. On July 14, 1944, the Federal Ministry of Justice and Police instructed the authorities along the frontiers as follows:

The authorities are empowered to forbid a special category of refugees all access to Swiss soil, i.e., foreigners, who, because of reprobable deeds, appear to have made themselves unworthy of being given an asylum, or else, by their own activities, have impaired or endangered Swiss interests. [*New York Times*, August 2, 1944.]

Although this instruction can be interpreted in many ways, it is apparently directed against Nazi leaders. The right of asylum is no longer to be construed as a natural right that anyone can claim irrespective of his past; it is up to the national governments to regulate it on the basis of moral and political considerations. The *New York Times* hails the step taken by the Swiss government as "a gain of far reaching importance."

Sweden followed suit. The Minister of Social Affairs, Gustav Moeller, denounced the authors of the crimes committed during the war and gave the assurance that war criminals and traitors would not receive asylum in Sweden. Sweden will return to their own countries so that they may receive justice any war criminals who slip through the Swedish frontiers. During the war, Sweden's frontiers have been opened to many refugees. "However, there have been committed terrible deeds of such a nature that hardly anybody previously would have thought them possible in a world calling itself civilized." [*New York Times*, September 6, 1944.]

Even Argentina, the unknown quantity, released a declaration in regard to the right of asylum. The Argentine Charge d'Affaires in Washington, Rodolfo Garcia

Arias, declared on September 5, 1944, that "versions or suppositions" that Argentina might become a refuge for German leaders after the war were totally unfounded. The prepared statement reads as follows:

In view of versions which have appeared in the press to the effect that Argentina might become a refuge for Nazi leaders after the war, the Minister Charge d'Affaires of Argentina, Senor Rodolfo Garcia Arias, stated, "The fact that Argentina has no communication or relations with the Axis powers was not sufficient in itself to disprove these versions. I wish to add that I have express instructions from the Argentine government to state that such versions or suppositions are totally unfounded." [*New York Times*, September 6, 1944.]

The Spanish Ambassador, Juan Francisco de Cardenas, also stated on September 3, 1944, that "no one has ever contemplated providing a hiding place in Spain for the enemies of the Allied countries." [*New York Times*, September 6, 1944.]

The United Press reported from Ankara on September 14, 1944, that Turkey asked the former Bulgarian Minister for the Interior, Peter Grabowski, 'Bulgaria's War Criminal No. 5' to leave Turkey within three days, "in accordance with the Government's decision to refuse asylum to Axis refugees." The arrest of Grabowski would have been a more appropriate method.

It is imperative that our case be stated clearly. No right of asylum should be given to any of the German criminals anywhere, and those Nazi refugees against whom no indictments are known at the moment of crossing a border of a neutral country should be held at the disposal of the United Nations' courts until they have disposed of these escaped.

Germany will start a heated campaign clamoring for the democratic right of asylum which they themselves have detested and have never respected. The small fry will declare: "I am only a little man. I could not do anything else." And the higher-ups will proclaim loudly that they were merely obeying the orders

of Hitler, Goering, or Goebbels. They will clamor for asylum and appeal vociferously to humanity for the right of asylum. They will play upon the sympathy of the democratic world which they tried to destroy. As recently as July 31, 1943, the Nazi Information Service suddenly became a protagonist of the humanitarian principle of sanctuary and of the prerogatives of neutrals. It commented as follows on the Allied notes of warning to neutral countries not to grant refuge to war criminals:

This declaration is characteristic of the pitch of arrogance, impudence, and contempt for law which the Allied Governments have reached. It is one of the most elementary human rights to grant refuge to the persecuted. The political right of refuge plays a special part in international law: In times of war and political unrest it is one of the unassailable privileges of neutral states . . . Switzerland, for example, considers the right of refuge the most ancient foundation of Swiss neutrality. Any insult to, or infringement of, this right would act like a landslide, sweeping away five hundred years of Swiss tradition.

What is the actual standing of the case of the right of asylum? The right of asylum is a prerogative and not a duty of a state. It may be granted or denied at the discretion of each particular state. In the interests of those committing offenses of a purely political or ideological nature, however, there are certain basic moral principles in accordance with which the customs and spirit of international law demand that this right be exercised so as to prevent a political refugee from being handed over to his enemy and biased tribunals at home. We find the right of asylum expressed in international treaties and conventions in the form of a provision establishing exceptions to agreements for the extradition of criminals. Most of these treaties and conventions contain a clause to the effect that offenders convicted for purely political crimes or for crimes connected with political crimes, need not be extradited by any country that wishes to grant them the right of asylum. In my opinion, Axis

criminals are not entitled to claim asylum under this stipulation. In such treaties and conventions there are usually statements of limitation as to the conception of political crimes connected therewith.

Many of these treaties provide that the assassination of the head of a state will preclude a refusal to apply the rules of extradition. Where major common-law crimes, such as murder, kidnapping, arson, are involved in an indictment against a criminal claiming asylum, it is generally agreed that a state should not refuse extradition if such crimes are more important in the indictment than the political nature of the offense. According to the authoritative *Dictionnaire Diplomatique* (Article, "Asyl Droit de"), a criminal claiming asylum on the basis of being a political offender should not be granted such asylum if guilty of acts of "odious barbarism and vandalism opposed to the usages of war," or of other crimes, "opposed to the basis of all social organization and not against one or another state or form of government."

As far back as the days of the Weimar Republic, there were cases in which the German authorities did not live up to the democratic principles of the right of asylum in accordance with the cited interpretation. Hitler, who was stateless, and could be extradited to his country of origin (Austria) was able to organize in Germany a political movement which finally overthrew the democratic constitution, while a political refugee, the Italian anti-fascist Bassanesi *e.g.*, who flew from Konstanz (Bodensee) to his Italian homeland, where he scattered anti-fascist leaflets, was extradited by the Prussian police authorities, forced into this action by the insistence of the German Foreign Minister. The German Foreign Minister declared that Bassanesi had to leave Germany in the interests of cooperation with Fascist Italy. Bassanesi belonged to the "Justice and Liberty" movement, which had as its leader Roselli—living in France—assassinated by a

Mussolini gang some years later (1937).

In 1925, the case of two Spanish political refugees, whose extradition was requested by Primo de Rivera, then Dictator of Spain, aroused public opinion in Germany. The German authorities were not only satisfied to oust these two political refugees from Germany, but handed them over to the Spanish authorities, although that meant death to them.

The detestation that the Nazis have for the right of asylum is certainly not a surprising fact; again and again Hitler, in his speeches, attacked and menaced the refugees. In a speech delivered in the Sportpalast in Berlin on October 24, 1933, Hitler said:

It is true that together with the rights of the chosen people we defend the rights of the oppressed people, the German people, for in the last resort that is the reason for our being here at all! But that does not mean atrocities.

He proceeded to speak of the moderation displayed by the "Model Revolution":

It must be admitted that the 'emigrants' do not share this view. It is naturally very agreeable for knaves and usurers to travel around in world-history with a political banner to serve as a robe. It is a fine thing to be able to go abroad with the nimbus and the halo of one threatened with death, while in reality in Germany it is only the Public Prosecutor who is after you. And as for the small part of the emigrants which is really out of the country for political reasons I must confess that we are glad to be rid of them. We do not say: Give them back to us! On the contrary, we say only: Keep them and the longer the better.

On October 28, 1933, he spoke at Stuttgart, attacking the exiles and repeating his assertion that abroad they acted as though the bloody fist of National Socialism was behind them; in fact it was but the Public Prosecutor seeking to punish their crimes. Again, on October 30, 1933, Hitler spoke at Frankfurt and expressed his surprise that abroad the exiles from Germany were allowed to inflame peoples one against the other; Germany wished only that the War psychosis might at last be banished from the world.

On November 1, 1933, he spoke at Weimar and again mentioned the emigres:

The emigres are the poisoners of the wells amongst the nations. The disappearance of these elements from Germany is a great relief for Germany, and probably in a few months they will teach the world a great lesson . . . Never will I yield before a threat: I have never done so during the fourteen years of our fight for power: I will not do so to-day.

When Hitler's legal representatives appeared at the Sixth International Conference for the unification of the penal code in September 1935, in Copenhagen, they suggested a simplified type of extradition agreement under which no political refugee, if wanted by the Germans, would be secure in the country of refuge. In the magazine *Der Gerichtssaal* (1937, Vol. 109, 5/6, p. 172), the following case serves as interpretation of what Hitler, in his speeches, was after: Switzerland refused to extradite a refugee for the purpose of being sterilized in Germany. It was stated by the Germans that the sterilization was only a security measure and in no way a punishment. The German jurist concludes, therefore, that those persons who are wanted only for security reasons (and he includes explicitly political refugees) should be delivered by the respective state to Germany without the necessity of making a formal request for extradition. As the simplest way he suggests that such people be sent home in the usual manner, as e.g. people who are sent home because they have escaped asylums for mental diseases, or children or imbeciles who have run away. This expert sees no hindrance to the possibility of returning political refugees in the same simplified way. Germany (so he concludes) is primarily interested in the conclusion of international agreements regarding evictions and repatriations, and only secondarily in extradition agreements.

When, in 1938, the League of Nations, invited Germany to send delegates to the Conference to combat the terror which took place after the assassination of King

Alexander of Yugoslavia and Louis Barthout, the French Foreign Minister (1934), Germany did not send her delegates because her basic ideas of the right of asylum were not recognized in the preliminary discussions of this conference. What Germany thought to be the simplified method can be learned from the case of a German journalist, a political refugee, which occurred in the summer of 1938. It is also indicative of the sort of crime for which a Fascist Government should be forced to pay.

Franz Krause, a German journalist, born in Zeitz (Saxony) in 1900 and resident there until 1935, continued to be politically active as a Social Democrat after Hitler's seizure of power. He took part in charitably assisting the relatives of his comrades in prison, which, of course, was a punishable offense. When arrest became imminent he escaped to Prague at the beginning of 1935. He continued to work as a journalist, dealing largely with trade and industrial news. He was then a Czecho-Slovak national.

A friend told him of an opening at La Paz, in Bolivia, and at the beginning of January 1938, he decided to make the journey. He set out from Prague for Genoa, furnished with all necessary papers. On his arrival at Tarvis, the Italian frontier station, on January 8, 1938, he was at once arrested; no reason was given him. After two months under arrest completely cut off from the outer world and still without a word of explanation of his arrest, he attempted to escape. He failed and was sentenced to eighteen months' imprisonment for the attempt. Then at last he was shown a warrant for his arrest, dated Zeitz, March 12, 1938. According to this document he was suspected of "having murdered, at Cologne on the Rhine, in 1920 or 1921 or 1922," a woman "who is alleged to have been generally known under the name of 'Schwarze Locke'!" (Black Curl). The document alleged that "Black Curl" wanted Krause to marry her, that he

gave her a poisoned drink, that she lost consciousness, and that he then weighted her with stones and threw her into the Rhine. Herr Krause was able to prove that he had never been in Cologne.

This document was issued from Zeitz, where he had lived all his life, working for his living and engaging actively in politics as a Social Democrat. The Czecho-Slovak Consul General at Cologne inquired of the authority properly concerned, the Public Prosecutor at Cologne. The Prosecutor replied that he was aware that Krause (there were thousands of people named Krause in Germany) was suspected of the murder, but he could not confirm (though it should have been his own official concern) that "any penal or judicial proceedings had been instituted" or were intended to be.

Krause, the "murderer" of 1920 (or 1921, or 1922), had continued to live openly and unmolested in Germany until 1935. He had then lived in Prague without any attempt at extradition proceedings or even police inquiry from Germany. Never in his life had he been charged with any offence. Not until he had been two months in internment in Italy, for no reason that anyone could give him, did he at last receive a warrant of arrest from the entirely incompetent court of Zeitz. Germany asked for his extradition from Italy under the German-Italian extradition agreement of October 31, 1871.

This agreement provided for due judicial inquiry into the prima-facie case for extradition. If the clear provisions of the agreement had been adhered to no one need have been concerned for Herr Krause's fate. But the Investigating Department of the Appeal Court at Trieste expressed the view that it was not permissible to make any inquiry into the question of the existence of indications of guilt; extradition must be agreed to "on the simple warrant for arrest" and request for extradition from the German Embassy in Rome. It was by this decision,

dated May 16, that Herr Krause was menaced. The Ministry of Justice at Rome upheld the decision, and Krause became a victim of the simplification of extradition proceedings which Nazi Germany saw "as the best method."

The method used in the case of the journalist Krause might be called the indirect method—to circumvent the principle of the right of asylum. But the short history of the German refugees shows many examples of more direct methods used by the Germans. These methods were kidnapping and assassination.

One of the most exciting kidnapping cases occurred in March 1935, in Basle (Switzerland). The kidnapped refugee was Berthold Jacob, a journalist who rendered a valuable service to the world in denouncing German secret rearmament. For this reason he was well-hated by the Nazis. He lived in Strassbourg, and he was lured by a Gestapo spy, Hans Wesemann, from there to Basle. Jacob, whose financial circumstances were difficult, was told by Wesemann (who happened to write for the democratic newspapers during the Weimar days), that he could arrange to sell Jacob's article to an important British press service. He said that he would also help him to get a passport which would enable him to travel freely over Europe. The whole thing was, of course, a frame-up. Wesemann played Jacob into the hands of official Gestapo agents, who kidnapped him on March 9, 1935 and brought him to Germany. It was only by the insistence of the Swiss Government that Jacob's life was saved. He had to be returned to Switzerland some weeks later. The leader of the kidnapping expedition against Jacob was a high government official of the Berlin police, Theodor Fischer.

Even as far back as August 31, 1933, the Germans exploited the method of assassination against political refugees. A bullet shot on the dark night of August 31, 1933 hit Professor Theodor Lessing, a Jew, a Zionist, and a philosopher of the

highest rank. He had lived in Marienbad, Czechoslovakia since the spring of 1933 and he was killed by a Sudeten German who fled to Germany immediately after fulfilling his task. The German officials, asked to extradite the murderer, informed the Czechoslovak authorities that they were unable to find him.

On January 25, 1935, one of the meanest and most vicious crimes was committed against a German refugee, Rolf Formis, who had been a radio engineer in Germany. Formis was the man who cut off Hitler's famous election speech of 1933, which was supposed to have been broadcast over the transmitter of Stuttgart. He built a secret transmitter in the Hotel Zahorshi near Prague. The Germans sent a murder gang, consisting of Gert Schubert, Hans Muller, and Edith Karlsbach (who served as an *agent provocatrice*) to his hotel and they tried to kidnap him. In their attempt they failed, so they shot and strangled him and escaped.

Not only did the German Government inform the Czech authorities that they "were unable" to locate these people in Germany, but in addition, Gert Schubert was put in charge of the German press in Prague after March 15, 1939. There is a long list of similar cases. During the years 1934-1935 alone seven German refugees were kidnapped in Czechoslovakia. Five other attempts were unsuccessful. Spying on the refugees was done on a tremendously large scale, and the *Chronik* reports the discovery of nine such cases for the year 1934 alone.

Germany furthermore insisted that political refugees accused of capital crimes had to be turned over to the Nazis. One of the most tragic cases occurred during the latter part of 1938 in Czechoslovakia. Peter Forster, a political refugee, had killed an SS man in trying to escape from a concentration camp. He succeeded, went to Czechoslovakia, and for a long time extradition proceedings were pending against him. After Munich (Septem-

ber 1938) Czechoslovakia was too weak to resist the German demands, and Peter Forster was handed over to the Germans and beheaded.

Germany detested the right of asylum when she signed the Armistice with France in 1940. In the shameful terms of the armistice, Article 19 read as follows: "The French Government has to extradite to Germany all German subjects named by the German Government who are in France or in one of the French territories overseas." One of the consequences of this stipulation was the handing over to the Germans of two German Social-Democrats (among many others), Rudolf Breitscheidt and Rudolf Hilferding. Hilferding committed suicide shortly after his extradition and Breitscheidt was murdered at the beginning of September, 1944, since it was feared by the German Government that he could serve as a negotiating factor in an Armistice with the Allies.

The Germans execrated any right of asylum in the case of thousands of Jews who found refuge in France. The wholesale slaughter and deportation are too well known to be repeated here. Now the Germans are beginning to discover the fact that the principle of the right of asylum exists. They should be reminded of an article which appeared in one of their prominent newspapers, *Danziger Vorposten* on July 31, 1942, at the time when Switzerland was opening its doors to Jewish refugees fleeing from France, which stated as follows:

The latest Jewish invasion from France has increased the number of Jewish emigres in Switzerland to almost 15,000 . . . The advance guard of the war criminals who have pushed one country after another into the world-wide conflagration has knocked at the door of Switzerland and the Swiss have readily admitted it. The slogans with which they welcome the sons of Ahasuerus are "Traditional Right of Asylum" and "Pity the Innocent Victims" . . .

In the light of these facts, the Nazis have no legal or moral right to claim asylum. Marcel de Baer, the eminent Belgian Jurist, in the December 1943 issue of *Belgium*, proposed that neutral nations cooperate with an international body to try war criminals by "delivering" them to justice without any relation to the ordinary procedures of extradition. The United Nations should invite all neutral countries to sign an agreement to the effect that they will not only refuse admittance to war criminals, but also arrest any German refugees and put them at the disposal of the international body until such time that this body disposes of them.

The Germans did not show any scruples in their execration of the right of asylum—and neither should we in dealing with them, in view of the abominable crimes they have committed against mankind. Robespierre's words, "The Republic to the Republicans," should be applied in the amended sense: The principles of human rights are to be applied only to those who live up to them.

An American Dilemma

By WERNER J. CAHNMAN

AN AMERICAN DILEMMA* is the title of a two volume book which is one of the great events on the American book market of 1944. It deals with the most complex and disconcerting aspect of group relations and group conflicts in America, namely with the social role of the American Negro. In its present shape the book is the outgrowth of a cooperative study which was sponsored by the Carnegie Corporation and lasted for five full years. As responsible author and editor, a guest social scientist from Sweden, Dr. Gunnar Myrdal, was chosen (together with another Swedish scholar and a young American-Jewish sociologist). Dr. Myrdal's very distance from the problems under study seemed to ensure the impartiality which was desired; but no matter to what extent he justified, and could possibly justify, the expectation, it should be kept in mind that his work was aided by a well-manned American research staff of his own selection and by a host of first-class experts, both colored and white, who contributed the best of their experience and their materials to the common enterprise.

Some of the contributing studies, such as Melville J. Herskovits' *Myth of the Negro Past*, Charles S. Johnson's *Patterns of Negro Segregation*, Richard Sterner's *The Negro's Share*, and Otto Klineberg's *Characteristics of the American Negro* have already been published as separate volumes; others have been carefully filed for scholarly use. I have been

* *An American Dilemma, The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy*, by Gunnar Myrdal with the assistance of Richard Sterner and Arnold Rose, 2 Vols. Harper & Bros., 1944. 1483 LV & IX pp. Price \$7.50.

informed that the research memoranda which have been compiled solely for purposes connected with Dr. Myrdal's study would fill many rows of shelves in a library and that the total cost of the study amounted to a third of a million dollars. Many an old-time scholar, who wrote his *oeuvres complètes* in a garret or at the corner-desk of a dusty small town university seminar, after his working day was over, would have been overjoyed if he could have secured one tenth of a tenth of this sum for his purpose. Or, to put it in other words, how long (and for whom) will Jewish social scientists have to wait until they can present the universal dilemma, the case of the Jewish people, in an equally comprehensive way? For, with all reservations made and with all objections raised, the outcome of the Myrdal study is the most expert and exhaustive report on the American Negro which has yet been made. No literate person in America can from now on wash his hands of the slurs and crimes daily committed against the colored people in this country, saying that he didn't know.

The American dilemma, as the author sees it, is expressed in the discrepancy between the American creed and the American deed. The American creed, founded upon the precepts of evangelical Christianity, the philosophy of the enlightenment, the tradition of English law, and (as we should like to add) the experience of the American frontier, stands for equality of opportunity. The American deed, however, denies this opportunity largely to the "foreigner" and thoroughly to the Negro. As Myrdal himself puts it, "our problem is the moral

dilemma of the American—the conflict between his moral valuations on various levels of consciousness and generality. The 'American Dilemma,' . . . is the ever-raging conflict between, on the one hand, the valuations preserved on the general plane which we shall call the 'American Creed,' where the American thinks, talks, and acts under the influence of high national and Christian precepts, and on the other hand, the valuations on specific planes of individual and group living, where personal and local interests, economic, social, and sexual jealousies, considerations of community prestige and conformity, group prejudice against particular persons or types of people, and all sorts of miscellaneous wants, impulses, and habits dominate his outlook."

What Myrdal tries to show, in ever so many facets of appearance, is that from the glaring discrepancy between creed and deed follows not only the split in the institutionalized pattern of American life, but even more so the frustration and aggression of the Negroes and the uneasy conscience of the whites. Out of this same discrepancy arises the crazy-quilt of inhibitions and rationalizations which overload each and every discussion of the "Negro problem" both among white and colored discussants and certainly among a racially mixed audience. For instance, the American creed stipulates that the Negro in America, like any other American citizen, be entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; and so, institutions for the betterment of the Negro race are sponsored and Negro education is encouraged. Yet, on the actual American scene, the Negro is exposed only to the insecurity, not to the opportunities of freedom; he has lost his tenure as an inseparable part of the old plantation, but he is still virtually enslaved in the new South and kept in effective social and residential segregation in the North. The sponsorship is condescending, the organizations intended for the Negro's

betterment are not his own, and his education is inferior.

But this is not enough: the vicious circle continues. The Negro, says Myrdal, "is judged to be fundamentally incorrigible and he is, therefore, kept in a slum existence which, in its turn, leaves the imprint upon his body and soul which makes it natural for the white man to believe in his inferiority." The workings of this mechanism are well known to us. The Austrian playwright Franz Grillparzer, in his melancholy play "The Jewess of Toledo," points to the Jewish version of the story when he says: "We lame them first and blame them then for limping" ("*Wir laehmen sie und schelten wenn sie hinken.*") Considering both the Jewish and the Negro case, I am afraid that we have still to add one more deliberation. We should recognize that the mere expectation of behavior, if effectively maintained over a length of time, produces almost inevitably the expected result. The devil's ways upon this earth are precisely calculated.

To one accustomed to the blunt brutality of the Nazis, the devious ways and means by which most Southern and numerous Northern whites try to explain away their unawareness of, and uneasiness about, the actual conflict, are truly amazing. They have created for themselves, and for publicity purposes, a fantastic and evasive image of Negro-white relations, which relegates their better knowledge into the realm of the unconscious. On the other hand, the masterly description over many chapters, of the civic disabilities of the Negro, the tragic distortions of the Negro mind, and the ensuing neurotic self-contradictions in Negro activities, is bound to appear to numerous contemporary Jews as but a magnifying mirror of their own troubles. This is especially true of the Negro upper classes. Most upper class Negroes do not have the disgruntled sleeping-dog contentedness of the black folk. They are self-conscious and vociferous, although in

a contradictory way. Many of them look down upon the filthy and emotional masses but are thrown back upon them for economic and political support; they like to consider themselves as colored Anglo-Saxons but resort to race-pride at the same time; they seem to rely on an alliance with the "best people" of the other race and despise the "poor white trash" but, on second thought, they despair of the benevolence of employers-sponsors and propagate the gospel of unionism instead; their sensitivity suffers most intensely from discrimination, yet their interests compel them to uphold segregated institutions; hence, they pronounce publicly the philosophy of integration as their ultimate goal while they act quietly upon a policy which tries to take advantage of improved facilities within the system of segregation as a practical device.

Thus, the upper class Negro, shut off from normal participation in the white world, becomes a "race leader" who must needs hate everything which emanates from the white man. On the other hand, dependent as he is for white support on school boards, in foundation-councils, and a host of other institutions, he must with equal inevitability become a "white man's nigger" who caters to the white man's predilections and prejudices in order to maintain himself in his precarious in-between position. Of necessity, then, he must develop a dual personality; while the folk-Negro, in turn, is torn between pride in the great race-man's achievements and mistrust regarding the sincerity of his motives. He would like to follow a hero who, like Marcus Garvey in the twenties, defies the white man militantly; but Myrdal shows that extremist movements of this sort are doomed to failure precisely because they lack the white man's support.

All this is admirably told and will not fail to enlist the special interest of the Jewish reader. Most certainly, he will detect numerous similarities between the

situation of the upper class Negro and the one wherein the contemporary assimilated Jew finds himself; while the touching Biblical faith of the primitive Negro recalls Chassidic ecstasy. Jewish and Negro self-hatred are kindred phenomena and so are the old-time "*Stueblach*" and the store-front church. Besides, both Jews and Negroes are threatened by the same hatred and the same hostility. Upon the strength of this they could unite in action. But their reaction to the situation is different: the Jews are cautiously defending where the Negroes are militantly attacking. To review and compare the prevailing philosophies and ensuing policies of their leading civic organizations in terms of minority strategy, would be revealing.

It should not be overlooked that dangerous friction exists between a number of Jews and the Negro masses in Northern industrial areas. In this as in many a historically previous situation, the Jew appears all-too often as the exploiter while he is actually only the agent of the powers that be. This makes the ensuing friction especially vicious because of the tempting opportunity which it offers to both the wire-pullers of the ruling class and the demagogues of the masses to divert aggressive revolutionary sentiment into convenient anti-semitic channels.

The topic is wide in perspective but not touched upon in Myrdal's report. Even the coexisting frictions between the Negroes and other minority groups with whom they compete for industrial jobs and low-standard housing, and generally for social and economic status, are barely mentioned. Yet, these inter-minority frictions are as real as other aspects of Negro-white relations, to the point of being their predominant aspect in the industrial North; they are an intimate part of the entire system of race relations in America. One may say that the immigrant has been to the North what the Negro is to the South and, hence, the question could have been posed, in a study such as Myr-

dal's, as to whether or not the Southern Negro, in moving to the North, tends to transform himself, if slowly and painfully, from a subordinated race into a coordinated ethnic group.

There are more substantial objections to Myrdal's treatment of his topic. The validity of his theory as well as the conclusions to which he is led by it, can be sincerely questioned. As to his theory, he pins his whole argument on the contraposition of the American creed and the American deed, with the creed, and the deed only, as a peculiarly and lastingly American phenomenon. Yet, we may ask why action should be assumed to be susceptible to change while "creed" remains immutable? Could not the American creed of today be viewed as a cultural lag of the European creed of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and, if so, why is it that this cultural lag has persisted here while it has been obliterated by new layers of belief there? If it is true, as an influential school of American historians maintains, namely that American national character has formed itself on the frontier, is it then not probable that the closing of the frontier will shake the very foundation of the American creed as we knew it? In other words, once the belief that every barefooted boy carries an economic marshallship in his knapsack is refuted by unmistakable experience, will the ensuing mass and class antagonisms not spell the death-knell to the easy generalizations of simpler times?

By no means does Myrdal face a music such as this. Instead, after an imposing array of facts of the most bewildering nature has been presented, what are the conclusions that are drawn from them? In the last chapter of the *American Dilemma*, the author seems to envisage a future development which would be somewhat at variance in the North and in the South. He believes that the North is inevitably moving toward social and economic equality while he sees racial

tensions mount in the South. He thinks, moreover, that the North will set the pace of national development and that this, together with the slow growth of genuine liberalism in the South itself, will finally win over the white Southerner to "equalitarian reforms in line with the American creed." However, one should insert here that the Northern half of Myrdal's prediction may be upset if one introduces the disturbing factor of interminority frictions which Myrdal neglects throughout and upon which we have remarked earlier.

As to the prediction regarding the South, there is nothing in Myrdal's own interpretation of the Southern scene which would justify the happy ending with which he tries to endear himself to the more superficial among his readers. For of the antagonisms which beset the South, more than of those in the North, Myrdal is well aware. This is especially true of the Southern counterpart to Northern "interminority frictions," namely the sinister antagonism between the poor-white and the Negro laborer in the South which is so cleverly manipulated by wire-pullers and demagogues. In the face of all this, Myrdal resorts, in the final sentence of his book, to a generous trust in the "improvability of man and society."

Obviously, a trust such as this lies outside the realm of rational theory. The truth is that beliefs and attitudes are changeable, but for better no more than for worse, and in line only with the changes which take place in the material foundations of society. For instance, racialist theories are a likely accompaniment of colonial society which depends on cheap and servile native, slave, or immigrant labor for the maintenance of its functions. The equalitarian philosophy which grows in the same colonial environment, applies only to the settlers, not to the slaves. The settlers form a free and prosperous equalitarian society not in spite, but because of, the human

bondage in which they hold the members of a subjected and exploited race. Consequently, as the equalitarian and racialist philosophies condition rather than contradict each other, it seems doubtful whether the pangs of conscience, which Myrdal ascribes to the average (not to the Fellowship of Reconciliation type of) native-born white American, are an actuality in the minds of the people whom they supposedly disturb.

Careful observations of this reviewer would seem to indicate that the uneasiness about the changing aspects of the Negro problem, which is wide-spread in the North as well as in the South, is more akin to plain fear and bewilderment than to a troubled conscience. The fear may be of long standing, but it turns from a latent into an acute force now because the material foundations of American society are in the process of rapid change. This is especially true with regard to the South, which is still the key-region for the understanding of the Negro problem in America. A brief sketch of some of the main factors involved must suffice here. If the mechanical cotton-picker is introduced to the cotton fields of the Black Belt, several millions of field-hands may be thrown out of employment. This will tend to make the competition between white and colored share-croppers and tenants all the more fierce, their unionization more difficult. If, as a consequence, the surplus labor force moves from the cotton fields to the urban areas, both South and North and also West, one must fear that the racial conflict which embitters the competition for jobs will be carried, contagion-like, across the country. The situation will be further complicated by the return of impatient servicemen. Will considerable

numbers of Negro laborers, then, be able to leave for good their traditional "place" at the bottom of the social scale and to penetrate into the skilled industrial crafts? Or will they, more than ever, be thrust into unskilled occupations, if not into public relief? If so, can they be expected to take it?

A protracted period of post-war unemployment may well result in violent reaction and civic unrest. Of course, if the economic frontier of an interventionist America can be pushed across the oceans and new markets for American enterprise be opened in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, the answer to these pressing questions may be conveniently postponed. However, if the attempt at diversion fails, immediately or after some lapse of time, what will then be the answer? Race riots, massacres, and pogroms, or the victory of equalitarianism over racialism? Or, perhaps, in a dramatic sequence of events, both? Finally, if and when unequivocal equalitarianism emerges victorious, what will be the result? Physical amalgamation of the races or cultural pluralism within the framework of a multi-ethnic society? These are some of the questions which arise from a critical review of Myrdal's, and his collaborators', presentation and interpretation of the facts about Negro life and Negro-white relations in America. We agree with Myrdal that the answer will be of crucial importance for the future of our democratic institutions. But we should like to add that even the best-paid social scientist should not evade the question which is put to him by resorting to a premature harmonization of conflicting interests. Social, as well as individual, cancer cannot be cured by faith-healing.

A Bizarre Fellowship

By ELMER GERTZ

TODAY I READ of the death of William Ellery Leonard. The newspapers all said that only death had released him from his phobic prison, six blocks square, in Madison, Wisconsin. They said little of his splendid achievements in literature or of his mastery of much lore. Readers of the sensational press presumably were interested in learning that a professor was hysterically afraid to wander more than a few blocks from his home; they were not interested in the solid facts about a man who had a superb mind despite his phobia. The same newspapers told of new developments in the seditious conspiracy trial in Washington, in which the convicted Nazi agent, George Sylvester Viereck, is a principal defendant. Then a word spoken in dispraise of Ben Hecht's *A Guide for the Bedevilled* reminded me of another literary meteor, Ludwig Lewisohn, who suddenly discovered his Jewishness and forthwith left the Epworth League. For years I had not given a thought to the names of Leonard, Viereck, and Lewisohn in combination. Yet I knew quaint forgotten history about the three men, dating back more than forty years. All of it now buzzes back and forth through my mind and has meanings that I scarcely suspected when first I learned the details. Two of the men I knew intimately, and of the third I was told many things. It is a story that needs telling now, if only to place the Washington drama in an unsuspected setting.

* * *

A thin, elongated, tense Yankee scholar of twenty-five returned to America in

1902 from studies in Germany and travels in England and on the continent, gained in spite of poverty. The knowledge of many books was his and the wisdom that comes from difficulties. But he was not wholly assured of himself, nor truly a man of the world. William Ellery Leonard was a poet, a dreamer of quiet beauty. He was determined to justify the poet as scholar. Beauty was to him a lovely veil over the sensuous form of wisdom.

Leonard enrolled at Columbia University, so that he might write his thesis on Byron and Byronism in America. He had already studied at Boston University and Harvard. There he had been on terms of intimacy with the great psychologist and philosopher, William James. Leonard was not an easy social mixer; but he was more athletic than the average scholar, and he wanted companionship. This he received somewhat from James, and intellectual stimulation without end. He found comfort also in a few choice spirits older than himself. But he ached for something that he could not describe.

He wanted to continue his contacts with Teutonic culture. For languages lured him, and, in time, he was to know twenty-six of them. He wanted to live with a German-speaking family of some intellectual breadth. Old Professor Tombo suggested that he call upon Louis Viereck, one of the cultural pioneers in German America. Perhaps that debonair fellow in his bright middle years might give the eager young scholar asylum in his home. It would be worth attempting, Tombo told him. So he visited a little home in the upper reaches of Manhattan.

Louis Viereck's son, George Sylvester,

at sixteen was a cerebral elf, Leonard said. Leonard recalled that on his first visit to the Viereck home, George Sylvester followed his mother down the corridor of the house, and, upset that Leonard did not notice him, popped out from behind her skirts to proclaim himself, with the cry: "*Ich bin ein Dichter; ich bin ein Dichter.*" ("I am a poet; I am a poet.")

And, indeed, he was a poet, Leonard found. Leonard was in awe of the boy. More than thirty years later he confessed to me that he felt in the presence of the young Viereck as if he were near the youthful Goethe. The boy seemed to have the intensity of one destined for immortal renown. He posed, aped, play-acted; but to Leonard there seemed to remain an essence that was of breathless interest. It portended accomplishment beyond Leonard's wildest dreams for himself. He began to feel concern for the boy. His erratic capricious qualities worried him, as they did the boy's parents. He took a brother's concern in George Sylvester. The nine years' difference in their ages gave Leonard the right to act as an older brother. He discussed poetry, love, and life with the boy. The two took the same restless delight in sheer brains. They felt the same contemptuous dislike for the Philistines.

The elder Viereck looked on with mild hopeful amusement. Neither parent could understand the poetic temperament; but they could understand ambition, intelligence, verve. So they welcomed the stranger to their home and made him one of the family. At no time was he the mere roomer, the tolerated guest. He was one of the Vierecks. He could share the family's hopes and fears. He could laugh over Louis Viereck's humorous grumblings; his retreats from the house in the face of an invasion by young poets; his refusal to wear full dress when "Teddy" Roosevelt invited him to the White House. He could sip coffee within the family circle and talk, in German,

of all that mattered the world over.

To Leonard's corner bedroom at the Vierecks' came another miserable, the future author of *Up Stream* and *Israel*, who was then trying unsuccessfully to forget his Jewish origin. Leonard, in his autobiography, has painted a remarkable picture of Ludwig Lewisohn, who became a member of the Viereck entourage at approximately the same time as Leonard. The two were graduate students at Columbia. Lewisohn had lately arrived from the South, to which his family had moved from Germany just a few years before the Vierecks had come to America. Lewisohn was trying to be a Southern gentleman, transplanted to the north, although he was of definite Jewish appearance and instincts. This inner conflict was helping to form his character and career. Lewisohn became part of a strange trinity. He, Viereck, and Leonard became three musketeers, inseparable and mutually inspiring.

Leonard has left a memorable picture of Lewisohn seated at the typewriter in his room, ticking off Leonard's verses while Leonard lay in bed, declaiming them, like a poet holding court. Unshaven, excited, Lewisohn's appearance would be enough to startle the dead. In sonorous phrases, Lewisohn would shout out the praises of Leonard's verse. Mankind, especially the professors, should read his poetry. Leonard could not type? He, Lewisohn, his friend and discoverer, would type them. And so he did, night after night. His devotion was without limits.

The devotion of all three was limitless. I got the warm, delicious flavor of it many years later from Viereck and, above all, I got it from Leonard, then a phobic prisoner. His whole being was electrified as he recalled the talk of his old friends. "Sylvester has written accounts of conversations with the great ones of the earth," he told me. "They are weak, spineless, meaningless alongside of the conversations the three of us had these long

years ago. Ludwig, Sylvester, and I talked as I've never heard others talk since. We really had things to say! Ludwig would say, 'We three will become the leaders of American literature,' and we would believe him. Socrates would have reveled in our discourses, our speech-making to each other, our soul-talks. But never have we recaptured our early mood."

Then Leonard fell madly in love; an unreasonable, utterly foolish infatuation drove him frantic. The entire Viereck household sought to console him. Lewisohn discussed his plight in long resonant phrases. "You are experiencing the grand passion," he said, as Leonard perhaps wished he would not rub it in. George Sylvester tried an apple a day as a cure for Leonard's heartsickness. He would bring such little gifts to his elder friend. He would attempt in a soft, almost feminine manner, to cheer him up. It did no good. One day Leonard sent his lady love a feverish letter, proposing marriage. Her answer began: "Ellery, Ellery, Ellery, Ellery, Ellery," like the blows of fate on the casket of his soul. And it ended in a refusal, good-humored but final.

Leonard could no longer stand America. Germany was the one spot for solace. He decided to go at once, almost without leave-taking. "*Spielen Sie uns eine Comödie?*" asked Louis Viereck of him, by way of bewildered farewell.

Now letters took the place of personal contacts. Viereck and Leonard wrote to each other frequently, warmly, with mutual admiration. They exchanged their poems and offered suggestions. At home, Leonard and Lewisohn had been helping Viereck to acquire a knowledge of the English language and the separation did not terminate the lessons.

One day Leonard sent him a poem from Germany. Viereck praised it by saying that it would have been worthy of a Byron but not of Leonard.

In the absence of Leonard, Lewisohn moved into the Viereck home. He was

already virtually a member of the household; but this move intensified his relations with Viereck. Their friendship became lyrical, tense, trying, much too deep for their own comfort and well-being. Lewisohn wrote poems to the light-haired and light-hearted boy. He sang his graces. In a very real sense, he was enamoured of Viereck. He posed as a man of the world and spent all of his spare money to entertain Viereck. He wanted to dazzle him with his gallantry, and Viereck voiced no objections. Meanwhile both men gained in poetic power and fervor. Viereck particularly began to do inordinately good work. Soon Lewisohn and he agreed it was time that America learnt of the poetic virtues of Viereck. They decided to share the expenses of issuing a pamphlet of Viereck's best German poems.

Fifty-four pages in length, paper-bound and simple in appearance, there were just sixteen poems in the little volume; but they were all his—his to proclaim from the house-tops—his despite any echoes and unconscious borrowings—something to gloat over, even if he and Lewisohn did pay for the printing!

In a tone of extreme quietness, Lewisohn told, in an introduction, of the exotic literary phenomenon of German poetry written by men residing on American soil and away from the main currents of German life. Konrad Nies and Viereck were coupled by him as the two chief representatives of the genus, Nies the older "and in some respects the more accomplished," Viereck the more modern. He treated the individual poems in the little volume with respect. Each one was given its measure of praise. It was evident that he wanted to say more; but his dignity as critic and elder friend forbade. Perhaps, too, he feared that unrestrained praise, however well intentioned, might harm his precious friend, the "dear little boy" of his lyrical letters and secret poems.

And so he closed with a note of warn-

ing, a note perhaps of sad prophecy. "The best poetry cannot be written without a far profounder realization of the beauty and terror, the splendor and solemnity of the external world; without a keener consciousness of those great issues of human life and destiny which transcend even love," he lectured sonorously. "But within his own limits Viereck is a true poet. He has originality, he has power, he has imagination, and his extreme youth gives his talents large possibilities of development."

Leonard, by then returned to America, sang the praises of the little book of German poems in the columns of the *Boston Transcript*.

"In maturity of art I know not where to find his parallel in English letters, unless in the Rowley poems of the marvelous boy who perished in his pride . . ." said Leonard. Later, he wrote a sonnet in Viereck's honor and there called him the marvelous boy who conquered in his pride. "I am aware," he said, "that any comparison of an obscure New York school boy with Goethe and Byron must strike the reader unpleasantly, but the critical conscience should not wince at that. . . . On one reading you pronounce him a decadent. But if you read him again you must admit some noble elements of thought and strength and pathos."

These two men, Leonard and Lewisohn, were, after all, intimate friends of Viereck's and their praise of Viereck was to be expected. But they were joined by others, in a full blast of honor for the young poet.

The *Washington Post*, the *New York Sun*, the *New York Herald*, the *New York Times*, the *London Literary World*, the *New York Globe*, the *Review of Reviews*, and dozens of magazines and newspapers, published both here and abroad, sounded the tocsin.

It could not fail to please the three conspirators. It could not help but cement their friendship. They gloried in it; the one urged the other to join the ranks of

published poets. "We three will become the leaders of American literature," Lewisohn repeated. The prophecy might well be realized. But life itself was cruel, insistent. It left too little time for high dreams. Viereck could remain in New York to pursue his career; but Lewisohn and Leonard were necessarily cast adrift. They were compelled to earn a livelihood, first of all. Dreams of immortal fame had to abide the financial issue, especially since Lewisohn took to himself a wife.

By painful steps, Leonard gradually became a teacher at Wisconsin's State University. He rolled logs in Lewisohn's behalf and the future author of the *Island Within* became an instructor in German at Wisconsin, although he longed to teach the language of the land of his adoption. Naturally, the friendship of the two older members of the trinity was intensified. Too soon, however, Lewisohn accepted an appointment at Ohio State, while Leonard remained at Wisconsin until his recent death, bound there by the cruellest ties of fate, his famous phobic prison. The story need not be rehearsed here. It is given lasting form in *Two Lives* and *The Locomotive-God*. There we learn that Leonard's psychotic ailment was caused by the combination of certain childhood frights and the unjust treatment he received when his wife, driven by her inherited insanity, committed suicide. Despite his phobia, Leonard was essentially a sane solid man, whose rich poetic imagination rose four square on a bed-rock foundation. Few poets have been more inspired in their treatment of every day social and human problems.

Lewisohn, likewise, was stirred to great utterance by the experiences of his youth. Implicit in his *Up Stream* is the story of his association with Viereck and Leonard, although he publicly says little of them. Lewisohn, in the thrall of work, can forget anybody; and Viereck, a prisoner to his overwhelming ego, has cast a dark shadow over the old association. Yet it affords a clue to the disgrace into

which the Wonder Child has fallen. Viereck, the Nazi propagandist, is the same clamorous exhibitionist who first greeted Leonard in 1902. Having failed to receive continuously the desired notice and compensation through literature, Viereck turned to other fields of endeavor. Their baseness did not deter a spoiled brat who felt contempt for the petty strivings of others. It is a tragic story that will some day be told in its proper perspective when Viereck and his precious Nazi paymasters are ground into dust.

But part of the story should be sketched now in order to invite the later full chronicle. Not long after the appearance of his little volume of German verse, Viereck's first work in English was published by Brentano: a slender book of sensuous exotic plays. Then appeared a book of lush rolling verse called *Nineveh*. No poet since Byron created so great a sensation over night. Today it is difficult to believe that all over America the young poet was talked about and praised by such diverse characters as the President of the United States, the bellowing Teddy Roosevelt, and the discerning critic, James Huneker. Viereck was looked upon as the leader of a poetic renaissance. He was lionized, and he strut-

ted about as if the acclaim would last forever. But almost as soon as he reached the heights, his descent began. By 1914 it was clear that other literary voices were gaining ascendancy over his: Sandburg, Lindsay, Masters, Millay, half a dozen others. It was then, for the first time, that he became the sinister spokesman for warring Germany. He was a founder and editor of *The Fatherland*, the uncompromising defender of the Teutonic cause. Again there was notoriety, excitement, money, the deceptive indicia of success. After the Armistice, Viereck remained for a time a literary outcast. It was bitter gall for a man of his immodest temperament. Then in collaboration with Paul Eldridge he wrote a series of novels about the Wandering Jew. There were elements of greatness in the series; but it was obvious by the time the third volume appeared that Viereck had written himself out. The creative impulse was becoming feebler. Hitler came to the rescue of the jaded artist who forever sought superexcitation. Once more he became the agent of a marauding German government. By now it could mean only moral collapse, an end to any semblance of righteousness. The bizarre fellowship of Viereck, Leonard, and Lewisohn was at an end.

AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL

By A. M. KLEIN

I

Out of the ghetto streets where a Jewboy
Dreamed pavement into pleasant bible-land,
Out of the Yiddish slums where childhood met
The friendly beard, the loutish Sabbath-boy,
Or followed, proud, the Torah-escorting band,
Out of the jargoning city I regret,
Rise memories, like sparrows rising from
The gutter-scattered oats,
Like sadness sweet of synagogal hum,
Like Hebrew violins
Sobbing delight upon their eastern notes.

II

Again they ring their little bells, those doors
Deemed, by the tender-year'd, magnificent;
Old Ashkenazi's cellar, sharp with spice;
The widows' double-parloured candy-stores
And nuggets sweet bought for one sweaty cent;
The warm fresh-smelling bakery, its pies,
Its cakes, its navel'd bellies of black bread;
The lintels candy-poled
Of barber-shop, bright-bottled, green, blue, red;
And fruit-stall piled, exotic,
And the big synagogue door, with letters of gold.

III

Again my kindergarten home is full—
Saturday night—with kin and compatriot:
My brothers playing Russian card-games; my
Mirroring sisters looking beautiful,
Humming the evening's imminent fox-trot;
My uncle Mayer, of blessed memory,
Still murmuring Maariv, counting holy words;
And the two strangers, come
Fiery from Volhynia's murderous hordes—
The cards and humming stop.
And I too swear revenge for that pogrom.

IV

Occasions dear: the four-legged aleph named
And angel pennies dropping on my book;
The rabbi patting a coming scholar-head;
My mother, blessing candles, Sabbath-flamed,
Queenly in her Warsawian perruque;
My father pickabacking me to bed
To tell tall tales about the Baal Sham Tov,—
Letting me curl his beard.
O memory of unsurpassing love,
Love leading a brave child
Through childhood's ogred corridors, unfear'd!

V

The week in the country at my brother's—(May
He own fat cattle in the fields of heaven!)
Its picking of strawberries from grassy ditch,
Its odour of dogrose and of yellowing hay,—
Dusty, adventurous, sunny days, all seven!—
Still follow me, still warm me, still are rich
With the cow-tinkling peace of pastureland.
The meadow'd memory
Is sodded with its clover, and is spanned
By that same pillow'd sky
A boy on his back one day watched enviously.

VI

And paved again the street; the shouting boys
Oblivious of mothers on the stoops
Playing the robust robbers and police,
The corn-cob battle,—all high-spirited noise
Competitive among the lot-drawn groups.
Another day, of shaken apple-trees
In the rich suburbs, and a furious dog,
And guilty boys in flight;
Hazelnut games, and games in the synagogue,—
The burrs, the Haman rattle,
The Torah-dance on Simchas-Torah night.

VII

Immortal days of the picture-calendar
Dear to me always with the virgin joy
Of the first flowering of senses five,
Discovering birds, or textures, or a star,
Or tastes sweet, sour, acid, those that cloy;
And perfumes. Never was I more alive.
All days thereafter are a dying-off,
A wandering away
From home and the familiar. The years doff
Their innocence.
No other day is ever like that day.

VIII

I am no old man fatuously intent
On memoirs, but in memory I seek
The strength and vividness of nonage days,
Not tranquil recollection of event.
It is a fabled city that I seek;
It stands in Space's vapours and Time's haze;
Thence comes my sadness in remembered joy,
Constrictive of the throat;
Thence do I hear, as heard by a Jewboy
The Hebrew violins,
Delighting in the sobbed oriental note.

Palestine and Power Politics

By ISACQUE GRAEBER

I

AS IN THE CASE of any other principle which conflicts with power politics, that of international trusteeships is either strong enough to limit it or, if weak, becomes subservient to it. The fate of minorities is usually less dependent on their own strength than on the interest taken in them by other powers, which may be influenced by the desire to improve the lot of such groups with which they are connected by religious, national, or other ties. Motives of this sort have certainly influenced, at least to a limited extent, the collective intervention of the European states in favor of Christian subjects within non-Christian lands. On the other hand, it may be that a program of this sort aims at winning the goodwill and support of minorities during crucial periods in countries or zones still neutral.

In the pattern of ideas, beliefs, interests, motives, and doctrines—all operating together and subtly interwoven—that had been so raucously proclaimed and promulgated by the Allies during World War I, the Balfour Declaration, viewed in the light of *real politik* rather than in the spirit of Santa Claus, as some adherents of the idealistic school would have it, may be considered as an instance of the latter. That this rather than other motives affected Great Britain, is clearly discerned in the Parliamentary debate in 1917 and confirmed in Mr. Churchill's own candid admission that "it was considered that the support which the Jews could give us in the United States of America and also in Vienna would be a palpable advantage to us."¹

¹ Debate on Palestine in the House of Commons, July 4th, 1922, Hansard, 5th Series, vol. 158, coll. 329.

No less significant and worth noting is the fact that similar considerations and motives of power politics influenced not only the Allied Powers but the Central Powers as well. The German government from the beginning of the war not only coquetted with the Zionists, but made strenuous efforts to win the support of the Jews of the United States; and the moment the Balfour Declaration was published she could no longer stay behind. Accordingly, she pressed her Turkish ally to make the necessary concessions, while keeping an eager but tender eye on the President of the World Zionist organization, Otto Warburg. In January 1918 the German Foreign Office announced the willingness of the Turkish government to assist and further the growth of Jewish colonies by granting free immigration and local political autonomy within the framework of the Turkish Empire. While this pledge was not so far-reaching as the one the Allies made to the Jews, yet compared to the second declaration, which governed the rights of the Jews in German-occupied territory, it held out a promise of greater significance than the obligations undertaken at Versailles. However, all that came too late, for in the meantime Lord Allenby had already occupied the South of Palestine and entered Jerusalem, and the sudden collapse of Germany followed soon thereafter.

This is not the place to assess the political potential of the Jewish people in the first World War. It is sufficient to state that both warring camps, now Germany, now Great Britain, both tried to use the Jews as a political instrument and it is thus that they became the recipients and

seemingly doubtful beneficiaries of political pledges.

Conversely, one might note that the progressive deterioration of the social and economic status of Jewry on the continent after World War I, organized anti-Semitism and the corresponding low morale which had prevailed in the large concentrations of Eastern and Southeastern Europe, the intra-Jewish conflicts in West European and American communities, have in no small degree contributed to the present helplessness of the Jews. No less important was the fact that the Jews have made a fetish out of the parties of liberalism, with which, significantly enough, the public conscience is particularly associated. The degree to which the governments of the democracies have abandoned Jewry to its own tragic fate can be directly attributed to the inertia and utter passivity of the democratic nations. Nevertheless, the Jews of the democracies have yet to tap those potentialities and resources which, if channelized and properly directed, will not only win them sponsors and allies, but will bolster their ranks as well.

For the last two centuries the Near Eastern shores of the Mediterranean have been a major British strategic concern. Different policies have been adopted at different times, but the underlying motives of British policy remained the same. British supremacy in the Arab world, for primarily strategic reasons, had to be maintained: this necessity was to determine the degree and the nature of the independence which the Arabs were to be granted. But with the issuance of the Balfour Declaration in 1917 and the British Mandate over Palestine in 1922, a shift in emphasis was effected in British policy—to bolster and maintain Britain's authority through the formation of "a little loyal Jewish Ulster in a sea of potentially hostile Arabism." In the long chain of grim events and dramatic happenings nothing perhaps throws more light on the way in which Great Britain

used the Jews to maintain its authority than the Partition Scheme of 1937, which, if carefully scrutinized, will be seen to have been a logical development of the schemes of 1917-21. That, it is submitted, has been the main importance of Jews in Palestine to Britain since 1920.

For the strategic position of Palestine has grown more and more important. On the one hand, the success of the Egyptian national movement and the emerging Arab movement have made British control of the Eastern end of the Mediterranean considerably more difficult; on the other, there was the increasing realization that the reserves in the oil of the Near and Middle East will play a capital role, so much so, that the country or countries controlling them hold an important element of world power; and finally, the vital importance of the oil of this region for the Empire. The United Kingdom, in 1938, received from Iran alone approximately 1/5 of its requirements. Aden, India, Malta, British Malaya (formerly), Ceylon, Egypt, and South Africa derive their oil supplies from this region. The refuelling of ships at Port Said, Alexandria, and Suez, alone represents an annual consumption of a million tons. Also, it is the oil of this region that supplies the British—and American forces—Mediterranean and Pacific fleets, the R.A.F. in the Middle East and the British armies guarding the outposts of the Empire. In 1939 the Near and Middle East produced a total of approximately 17 million tons of oil, or 6 per cent of the entire world production. The control of Palestine had even become more vital, as the Axis had begun to lay hands on strategic points at the Western end and, as their challenge to the British Empire had become more and more pronounced it was the new refineries of Haifa and Abadan that rendered Britain's oil position more secure. That is why Palestine held the key of victory and defeat in the Near East.

In sum, what Great Britain as a world

power needs in Palestine, above all, is an excuse for remaining there. . . . For the strength of Britain in the Near East is that of the "man in possession."²

We cannot here review in detail the many complicated questions which arose in the course of the administration of the Palestine mandate, particularly with regard to the creation of a Jewish National Homeland, but must limit ourselves to one observation, namely, that Britain's actions in Palestine were motivated by one major consideration—to insure her strategic position in the Near East. It was not by accident that the Baldwin Declaration in the House of Commons³ was adopted as the legal stand point of Great Britain, i.e., before any transfer of an "A" mandate could be accepted—Palestine is the only remaining mandate—the acquiescence of the inhabitants of the territory, the consent of the mandatory power, and of the power to whom the territory was to be transferred, and also the unanimous consent of the League Council would be required. Yet, not much later the mandatory, Great Britain, "had shown scant courtesy to the observations of the Mandates Commission,"⁴ which was critical of British policy because it had "helped to encourage the Arabs in the belief that by resorting to violence they could succeed in stopping Jewish immigration."

Watching Britain's actions in Palestine today, the world will try to estimate the ideas and the spirit which England is likely to bring to the reconstruction of the promised new order of to-morrow. Many causes have contributed to give Palestine a high symbolic importance in international affairs. On the plane of imperial exigencies, as well as on the legal and moral plane, Great Britain, as

holder of a great colonial empire, and as mandatory of Palestine is peculiarly tested. Will she keep the promises she made to the Jewish people in the spirit as well as in the letter or will she persist as she now does in playing power politics in executing the terms of the White Paper of 1939 which repudiates her international obligation—with which she was charged as mandatory since 1922? This question is now being asked in the United States, where there is a background of anti-imperialist tradition, and a critical attitude towards the British in the colonial empire generally. This question is also being put in other quarters, which are now gaining force and are awakening to the world-wide implications of the problems of Palestine.⁵ Also, the significance of Palestine reaches its highest intensity in the eyes of Jews, throughout the world. "For Zionism has become an impelling and overwhelming force. It represents a passionate conviction of many millions of Jews throughout the world and of several millions of American citizens. It has become a spiritual problem which must be solved."⁶

This, then, appears to be the background of opinion in the world against which Palestine affairs must be handled.

II

What of the United States? It is relevant to recall that the United States is not only involved in the Balfour Declaration, but was first among the great powers to which a proposal to administer "an internationalized Palestine" was made. As a leading member of the Principal and Associated Powers, she had been the most persistent and adamant claimant to equality of treatment in the A mandated territories in the Near East. Indeed, in this period (1920) were written the

² See Joseph Bloch's "Palestine in Der Welt-politik," in *Revolution Der Weltpolitik*.

³ Declaration in the House of Commons of Baldwin, April 27, 1936.

⁴ National Peace Council. Pamphlet no. 1, p. 21.

⁵ Carl J. Friedrich, *American Policy towards the Jewish National Home in Palestine*, pp. 26 seq.

⁶ Sumner Welles, *The Time of Decision*, pp. 266, 267.

strongest pages, reflective of an irrevocable policy, that had emanated from the State Department in the many years of Anglo-American diplomatic relations. The high tone of moral indignation and severe censure in which this government had rebuked the British Foreign Office for failure to carry out the terms of the Near Eastern mandates, is as revealing as it is significant for our own time. Wrote Secretary of State, Bainbridge Colby to the British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Lord Curzon:

This government notes with interest your statement that the draft mandates for Mesopotamia and for Palestine, which have been prepared with a view to secure equality of treatment and opportunity for the commerce, citizens and subjects of all states, which are members of the League of Nations will, when approved by the interested Allied Powers be communicated to the Council of the League of Nations. The United States is, undoubtedly, one of the powers directly interested in the terms of the mandates, and I therefore request that the draft mandate forms be communicated to this government for its consideration before submission to the Council of the League. It is believed that His Majesty's Government will be more ready to acquiesce in this request, in view of your assurance that His Majesty's Government is in full sympathy with the various principles contained in the previous notes of this government upon this subject. *The establishment of the mandates principle, a new principle in international relations, and in which the public opinion of the world is taking a special interest, would seem to require the frankest discussions from all pertinent points of view* [italics mine]. It would seem essential that suitable publicity should be given to the draft mandates which it is the intention to submit to the Council, in order that the fullest opportunity may be afforded to consider their terms in relation to the obligations assumed by the Mandatory Power, and the respective interests of all governments, which are or deem themselves concerned or affected. . . .

Your Lordship contrasts the present production of petroleum in the United States with that of Great Britain and some allusion is made to American supremacy in the Petroleum industry. I shall regret any assumption by His Majesty's Government or any other friendly power, that the views of this government as to

⁷ Papers relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, vol. II, 1920, p. 483.

the true character of a mandate are dictated in any degree by consideration of the domestic need or production of petroleum, or any other commodity [italics mine].

The government of the United States assumes that there is a general recognition of the fact that the requirements for petroleum are in excess of production and it believes that opportunity to explore and develop the petroleum resources of the world wherever found should without discrimination be freely extended, as only by the unhampered development of such resources can the needs of the world be met.

But it is not these aspects of oil production and supply, insofar as they are of domestic interest to the United States, with which I am concerned in this discussion. I have alluded to them in order to correct confusing inferences liable to arise from certain departures, which I believe I discern in Your Lordship's communication, from the underlying principles of a mandate as evolved and sought to be applied by the Allied and Associated Powers to the territories brought under their temporary dominion, by their joint struggle and common victory. *This dominion will be wholly misconceived, not to say abused, if there is the slightest deviation from the spirit and the exclusive purpose of a trusteeship as strict as it is comprehensive.*⁸

When passing from a consideration of this clearly-enunciated, vigorous policy and underlying principles to an examination of more positive effective action implementing them, we move from a field in which a degree of certainty is attainable to one in which everything seems to be characterized by inaction and a desire to shirk a share of responsibility. This pronouncement, far from being used as the foundation-stone of an energetic policy was in fact soon negated by subsequent action of this government—an action, which, as Professor Friedrich, has so ably shown, became subject to wishful rather than realistic thinking, with the result that the leaders had misdirected their efforts.⁹ . . . August 24, 1921 can be said to mark the beginning of the political "disinterestment of the American government in the future development of the Mandate." At that time

⁸ Papers relating to the Foreign Relations of U. S. 1920, vol. II pp. 671-673.

⁹ Friedrich, Op. cit. pp. 9, 10, 11.

American Ambassador Harvey once again made representations to Britain to carry out the terms of the open door policy in Palestine. Britain, thereupon, invoked article 4 of the treaty it had with the Jewish Agency.¹⁰ The British reply, we are informed, "satisfied the United States,"¹¹ i.e., the United States proved willing to waive its hard-won right of the "open door" in Palestine in order to "facilitate the establishment of the Jewish National Home . . ." It would seem that this action encouraged Zionist leadership to persist in the claim that "American participation in settling the terms of the British Trusteeship for Palestine was by no means limited to safeguarding the interests of its nationals," although there is nothing to substantiate the belief.

Professor Friedrich's highly suggestive and realistic appraisal of America's policy toward the Jewish National Home in Palestine clearly shows how defective that policy has been; rather than bolster the Jewish National Home, as it was committed to do, it has, instead, aggravated the problem. As Friedrich succinctly puts it:

The background of our mistakes was provided by the failure of the British to carry out the purposes underlying the Balfour Declaration with firm resolve and then adoption, instead of a wavering policy and a progressive whittling down of the ideas of the National Home in a futile attempt to satisfy Arab nationalists as well as Jews. The core of our policy consisted in this! The United States, after having, through President Wilson, given approval and support to the original policy and officially reendorsed the Balfour Declaration by the resolution of Congress, withdrew from all responsibility for this policy and contented itself with occasional expressions of sympathy meant largely for home

¹⁰ Article 4 obliges the mandatory to ask the advice of the Jewish Agency "recognized as a public body for the purpose of advising and cooperating with the Administration of Palestine in such economic, social and other matters as may effect the establishment of the Jewish National Home and the interests of the Jewish population in Palestine."

¹¹ D. F. W. Van Rees, *Les Mandats Internationaux*, pp. 150, 151.

consumption, while declining to take concrete and practical steps giving Jews such diplomatic support as lay in our power to give.

This, combined with the fact that no consistent pressure was brought to bear upon the American government, resulted in a policy of inaction.

So much for the past. What of the present and the future?

Radically different and infinitely more formidable than in the First World War is the problem that exists today, not only on account of the number of surviving Jewish "Exiles" whose fate is worse than that of any other exiles in that they have no country they can call home, but also because the world has since grown static and stereotyped. Rendered stateless and reduced to the status of social pariahs, the Jews will presumably regain civic rights once the German armies are defeated in Europe. But at best there can be no automatic restoration of the Jews to anything like their former position. In Eastern and Southeastern Europe the problems which existed before Hitler's day will reappear in circumstances which will make them even more difficult to solve. The bulk of the upper and middle classes, who were the chief employers of Jewish workers, will have lost their property. Jewish business men will have lost all contacts with their former non-Jewish clientele. Their position will meanwhile have been occupied by non-Jewish competitors. In brief, the great part of European Jewry will have lost their former social and economic status. The problems thus raised are as difficult and as complex as any that are likely to arise after the war in relation to the smaller nations. On the other hand, if a wave of intensified nationalism sweeps over Europe the Jews are hardly likely to be given ethnic rights.

There is also the fact that the day of mass migration is over, and that under the jolt administered by events of 1914-18 the wheels ceased to revolve and a period of closed frontiers followed in its wake.

The movements of peoples were henceforth to be the object of strict national control. In 1923 the United States, which for three generations had been to the oppressed everywhere as the land of great open spaces and unlimited opportunities, closed its doors to immigration; and this act more than any other was the symbol of a world of closed frontiers and stationary populations. In this connection—and highlighting the importance Palestine has assumed for the Jewish people—when the last great blow to international migration was delivered by the world depression there was one outstanding exception, Palestine, where there was a continuous rise in the number of Jews absorbed.¹² There is serious and justified doubt whether the “closed door” regime since rigidly maintained throughout the world will undergo any modification after the war.

Yet it is generally agreed that to meet the urgent needs of surviving European Jewry there will have to be migration to Palestine, which is now barred to the Jews. Even if this is to be successfully accomplished, international action will be absolutely necessary. Indeed the whole course of the present war compels the need for a greater measure of international responsibility for the future of the Jewish Homeland. “I cannot see,” writes former Under-Secretary of State, Sumner Welles, “any possibility of a permanent solution through the continuation of a British mandate. . . . What seems to me essential is an international agreement upon a program that leads step by step to an independent status of Palestine as the National Home of the Jewish people.” It is clear that something more positive is called for from civilization than the barrenly static notion of trusteeship and a repetition of the fatal defects of the mandate system. What is needed is a method which involves the extension of autonomy and self-determination through the fields

of internal and external affairs until all control is removed and Palestine issues into a full national Jewish Commonwealth.

As far as America is concerned, there are weighty reasons—practical and political as well as psychological for it to take a leading part in this question. Much has been written to give some idea of the spirit in which the prevalent school of American thought approaches the future. In brief it recognizes that the preponderant economic position of the United States imposes upon it a special responsibility, inasmuch as by its policies the economic and, therefore, to a large extent, the political harmony of the projected world community will be determined. The future course of American policy with respect to Palestine and mandated areas may be foreshadowed by the action taken at the Havana meeting in July 1940.¹³ Weighty practical reasons call for an increased American interest and participation in that part of the world. United States interest, after the last war, in the exploitation of the Near Eastern oil-fields and more recently, in the development of those at Bahrein Island and Saudi Arabia, is well known. And in view of the geologists’ estimate that, at the present rate of extraction, the known American oil wells will be exhausted within approximately 18 years, the reserves in the soil of the Near East will doubtless intensify that interest. There are also important psychological reasons for an increased interest in Palestine. The American people combine all the racial stocks of Europe as a whole rather than deriving from any particular part of Europe. While the use of the English language forms a bond of special intimacy with Great Britain other factors exist and exercise an intangible but none the less real influence over the conduct of American relations. The fact that the Jewish population of the United States is close to five million, many of whom are active supporters of the “great purpose of a national Jewish Home in Palestine,” cannot safely be ig-

¹² Cf. Author’s “International Migration” in *Rescue*, Sept. 1944.

nored in the development of American policy. In the United States, where major policies are determined in some measure by public discussion, the pursuit of an unsentimental and exceedingly realistic policy is more likely to disturb the domestic tranquility of the American people than to bring peace and harmony to a distraught world. There is finally a moral objection to the traditional British policy of power politics. The American people, with less consciousness of danger than the British with their far-flung empire, are less disposed to subordinate moral exigencies. Moreover, the American people desire a policy which they can pursue consistently and can justify at least to themselves in the Americas and in Asia. For these reasons Woodrow Wilson's attempt to put power politics and the "new concept in international relations," the Mandates, upon a moral basis by means of the Covenant of the League of Nations made a profound appeal to thoughtful

Americans. There is the additional fact that conditions in the Near East have become especially acute and constitute one of the standing sources of friction and international rivalries and schemes for a new balance of power politics unless there are clear-cut decisions and a firm policy with respect to each of the Near Eastern countries, backed by strong international action. And should this increasingly paramount question of the Jewish Homeland not be solved, "it may well become a disruptive force which would certainly impair the ordered stability of the kind of the world we desire to see organized in the years to come." Looked at more positively, it is high time that the UNITED NATIONS see to it that part of the problem of undoing an abnormal history is to restore the self-respect and inner integrity of the victim of that history.

¹³ For an elucidation of this policy see Arthur Holcombe's, *Dependent Areas in the Post-War World*. pp. 80 seq.



Historic Peoples

IRVING KRIESBERG

Make Thy Face Clear Before Mine Eyes

By KATHERINE KORNBLAU

IT ALL STARTS with Jew or Gentile, and it never stops, year after year, yourself the Jew and the other the Gentile, looking, listening, feeling, enduring, watching, minute after minute and hour after hour, and yet it is now this second, the second of your feeling, the final second, which is empty and most pitiful. It is because we know, and I know having lived among the Jews, now darkest because of my knowledge, and Jews now killed, having had a bit of the taste which is now only a nightmare, of Jewishness and this plague, a paper I was reading and the names I read tumbling in and out across the page, names sticking close to me—Goldberg, Finkelstein, Cohen, and the rabbis and teachers, the lawyers and doctors, and I, a mere girl, shedding a tear, knowing something, feeling something.

At the beginning she went to Hebrew school. It was because she wanted to find out, sitting in the school, listening to that which had happened from the very beginning of time. She used to listen so attentively, and she used to want to learn so much, that she would forget she was a mere girl; she would think that she was perhaps a scholar to make others know what had happened. She used to go down the streets like a wise person, bubbling all over inside, in her mind, around her heart, in her eyes she saw those people, the people who were alive in her, and the sight of their faces, and their bodies, the faces of God and Noah, and the way the earth was made, and the creation of all living things, and the glory of all the heaven and earth, all of it, of another time and her life, a piece of her. She dreamed through the streets, walking

and floating, silent, quiet about the things she felt, feeling and tingling, thoughts stirring to the harmony of the Bible, walking and floating, to the bible of Jews and back again to now, walking and floating, knowledge and new vision, and the girl in the city, walking through it like a wisp of air, dreaming dreams.

The streets were crowded, but her being in it was remarkable and wonderful. Her dress would be poor with the poverty of the neighborhood, and her face would be pale with the poverty of gray skies, but it was magnificent to be living and feeling, of the people in the Bible, from week to week, new episodes, new stories unfolding.

In the winter it would be very cold and her body would quiver for the heavy warmth of a coat, and she would think of the Garden of Eden, and the stillness of moist air, but ever she would remain in the city, dreaming. It was her way and she was the girl, and she desired the city to stay the way it was if it was God's way. She would understand it someday. She used to watch the rabbi standing at the stove in the lonely Hebrew school, teaching the alphabet, cold, stiff fingers writing out the letters for them, and she used to see him sad in the school, never being gay and never smiling, and she used to wonder about it. Why, she used to wonder, why is he so sad, being a rabbi? Why do your eyes look so pitifully upon me? Why do you stare at me, looking deep into my eyes, cautioning me in that somber glance? And she used to have him come, in too cold weather, to her house, and there she would observe the rabbi who at school seemed

washed in tears, a heavy bearded man, a man with a long, lean nose and sunken eyeballs, who had tears in his voice, tears for whom? This rabbi, her teacher, what secrets did he know, teaching in the school, in her home, never laughing or smiling like the teachers at public school, only sad and sometimes swallowing the lumps from his bearded throat? What was this tormenting trouble in him, with a mind like his and with the visions hidden in the sunken eyes of that face, what hope or hopelessness? He would come into the kitchen and sit on a chair and she would observe the eyes fighting against something, trying to hold something back. He's got a secret, she used to think. That bearded face knows something. What is it?

In the summer she wouldn't see the rabbi. It would be only in the winter. The rabbi was like the Bible, full of stories, of God, knowledge and tears hidden in his brown eyes. In the summer it would be hot and there would be suffocating days. The heat would settle upon her and her face would be perspiring, but she would not complain, and she would play in the streets, enjoying whatever it was that children enjoy, and that grown-ups look so nostalgically back to, and she would go to the synagogue and in the plainness of it see how it was with the men of the Jews when they prayed, how the prayers transformed the hollowness of their eyes. Her face would stay quiet with the glow of worship and she would stand near the back, leaning against the plain wall, listening, the prayers about her ringing softly in her heart.

I was this girl and she is gone now, but she will be walking through the city when my eyes no longer search into the hearts of men, and if it is not this girl it will be someone else, perhaps myself again, or another one living in the city, dreaming the beautiful dreams of life, picking the wonder and divine from that which is evil and which is bitter.

The office building stood in the middle of downtown like a mountain, and she entered through its revolving door, small, there in the midst of activity, of business in motion, the crowds of her own people, and of herself sheltered by them, suddenly gone. She saw the name: American Manufacturer. She saw the blank blue eyes of business frozen on her: Ruth Goldstein. And she saw the gentile eyes of hate foaming furiously. In the office the weight of prejudice fell upon her and she saw the ghosts of Christ scorning and fuming, making soundless torturing movements: The name is Ruth Goldstein. She saw the panicky eyes, shunning understanding, thoughts racing, the effort and inadequacy of words, Jew, and eyes glaring from his face, steel-cold eyes, tight lips, austere friendlessness, and a word at last, leaking through his teeth: Sorry! And walking in the streets of the downtown she thought of the interview, saw it, the Gentile and the Jew, the wordless enmity, the wordless hatred, the blockade, American Manufacturer, faces with eyes, Gentile people smug and smugly encircled, and aloof, and then the eyes again and a flat voice pronouncing a sentence, and herself turning quickly to hide the tears, and the blinding grief, and she saw the machinations of evil rising in her, aching for shelter, the evil of the scorn and the suffering, aching in her, she herself, eighteen years old, seeing it for the first time.

She is moving and is motionless, gazing at the multitude of faces, contemplating the differences of Jew and Gentile, moving along the street, troubled with the thoughts of injury. And at home their simple acceptance was too vexing. They didn't want me because I'm a Jew. Why didn't you tell me? she thought. Why are you letting me find it out so cruelly, their hatred for us? Is that why papa is a barber, alone and separated, staying in one neighborhood, never caring to change? Why didn't you tell me? Why must I learn it by myself?

God, she thought. Where is He? I thought I knew. A light in the souls of all men. He created the earth. Moses, a leader of Israelites, hearing God's words, guiding the Jews toward refuge, a face like the face of God. The round earth covered with people, people God loved, and people He Himself created. Don't tell me there's a difference. I saw it. I felt it. I heard it, the way he looked at me, the way the word 'sorry' came from his teeth.

She used to awaken at seven and walk to the Fred Mason high school. It was invigorating, the tang of early morning air, and it was pleasant to see the park, the winding park filled with the sparkling dew of morning. Hello, she used to say, and the candy man in the shabby clothes used to nod at her. The candy man used to say: First again. And he would smile kindly as to an intimate friend, and she would talk a while to him and buy a piece of chocolate. He would give her an extra piece, not letting her refuse, not making her feel embarrassed, and the little wise Jewish candy man would glow, and he would put the candy in a small paper bag and hold it out toward her. And the girl would look at him. He would shrug his round shoulders. It was nice chocolate, not too hard and often very mealy, sometimes it had peanuts in it. The candy man was pleased. He was very kind. He knew she was poor—her clothes—and he always made her feel rich.

Chocolate to eat, so that she could have pleasure for her mind and body. Food to make her grow, chocolate to give her pleasure, sometimes to satisfy her hunger for lack of enough substantial food, often to ease her craving for something sweet and tasty. Chocolate to munch on during lunch, many times instead of food, chewing, swallowing, keeping hunger from churning her insides. We like chocolate. There are nine at our home. We have chocolate once in a while. We don't care if it's not pure milk chocolate. We break off pieces. A bar of chocolate for nine.

We are often hungry. It is a treat to have chocolate after our supper. We eat the chocolate that is sweet and mealy. We bite into it, taking tiny pieces in our mouths. It is our way. We let it melt before we swallow. We like chocolate. We have it so seldom. The stove in our kitchen is small and we stand around it, trying to keep warm. We are nine children, a year apart, and the kitchen is our favorite room. We play games and it is full of laughter and friendliness and love and we are happy in our house. We eat chocolate that's sweet and mealy, and we are nine smiling faces.

Thinking, this girl vanished, and it is now I, another girl, no longer that girl, and the second is now, this second of my recollection. The park she loved: of all parks it was the most beautiful, and in the summer it stood shimmering, flowing, green-loveliness quivering in the sunlight. In the winter the greenness disappeared and the earth turned barren brown. The sky seemed darker and darker and the wind wandered and she hid her face from the wind, the wild wind, her breathing moist in a muffler.

Yet forever she came back to her youth, always back to the Hebrew school, the rabbi, the candy man, the kitchen stove, the chocolate, the nine children, always back to the feeling of wonder, where they were living out their youth, back always to the feeling of God, to the Bible and synagogue and park, never to the office building, always away from the Gentile and the hatred. The park was of that other time, the more innocent and believing time, shimmering, lacy and lovely and of great beauty, of trees and grass and of the sun and of the purity that was her youth. God in the beginning, creating the heaven and earth, and the spirit of God moving upon the face of the waters. She spoke to God, her lips soundless, spoke to Him with her mind, her heart, placing herself in His heaven, to become part of Him, and He seemed to hear. And He seemed to understand,

to be with her, in the young days, and to be close, watching, guiding, taking care of her belief, with Him then, my God, that in herself which was of God.

Gone, gone, that God and the girl, still somehow remembered, the rabbi swallowing his tears, and the girl trying to understand it in searching, questioning eyes; God, why hast thou forsaken me, the innocence has left me, the seconds of my being yearns to return, and You are gone forever, eluding my grim, taxing questions. Gentiles, she asked. What are gentiles? Are they people? are they? They are people? aren't they? Call me, then, a gentile. Call me a gentile, if they are people. And she saw the gentiles of the city distant and remote with arms out, keeping themselves clean from Jewish contamination. She herself longing for understanding, it would help make things clear, but they remained detached and she was herself once more. She used to think that Gentile and Jew could learn to feel sympathy for one another, one Jew and one Gentile to start, each himself as she, the girl, was herself, innocent, discarding heresy, friendly, recalling God's infinite wisdom as older men recalled it, praying for tolerance, to go on praying and believing, trusting and loving, but never aware, alarmed, terrorized, apprehensive of the difference, the arrogance of the gentile, who could be so cruel.

There were no voices with which to sound her suffering. All that she could do was cry, but even now I do not see the prejudice as the way of life. Mounting years have brought the disease of that intolerance to this mind and body, the one of this second, now, my being in this sunny room, lonely, as always, recalling the girl, bringing her to life, and still I do not understand the inhuman gentile.

The gentile people know no facts and they use the cross as a saber, a flaming sword, to kill the Jews. I see it as a poison and as a lack of education. I see the prejudice as crude and all gentiles who in-

flict crudity upon man, I see as men who have no brains, equipped to the hilt with insanity.

There is no such thing as a gentile. I see all gentiles as related to the Jews, their slaughter of the Jews is in a sense a slaying of their kin. The headlines shrieked of a monstrosity. What took place, she had to read, forcing the mind to know, 'Jews Massacred in Germany'—buried alive, tortured beyond human conception, many, many thousands, men, women, children, your brothers and your sisters, yes yours, for you are stemmed from the same creation as they. I wonder at our civilization. I remember the sifting in the holy Bible to make all men humble and clean, the condemnation of greed, of jealousy, of pillage, thou shalt not kill! To the Jews who are dead the problem is over, the horror remains for us. We are a handful of Jews staring wildly about us, seeing the holocaust and the destruction of intelligence, the holding back of development.

There she is walking in the street, walking, and it is 1938, pondering the atrocity of man to man—'Jews Massacred'—herself walking, living, feeling, 'Jews Massacred', all the faces reeling in her eyes, all the faces a gellatinous mass, the faces wavering like a thin stream of light through a transom, 'Jews Massacred', faces moving, faces bouncing, and the faces of the people of the world going about their daily lives, 'Jews Massacred', and no one crying. And another newspaper headline and another and another—'5,000 Jews Killed'—'10,000 Jews Die in Ghetto.' And the gentile man, smiling through his teeth. Smiling, chuckling, content. How can you? she asked. They're your people, too. Think—think back—who was Jesus? Think of that—admit the truth—who was Jesus? And you smile. What are you smiling at? Why do you pray? To whom do you pray? Think of it! And they killed your brothers.

Saturday would come. "The young and the old lie on the ground in the streets:

my virgins and my young men are fallen by the sword: thou hast killed, and not pitied." And she would sit on a chair by the window and she would weep, and she would hold the Bible in her hands and read. Yes, that was beautiful, that love of God was beautiful. God why are you gone? "And I gave my heart to know wisdom, and to know madness and folly: I perceived that this also was striving after wind. For in much wisdom is much grief: and he that increaseth knowledge increaseth sorrow." She sat on the chair by the window, alone and lonely, reading silently. I do not believe it, she said. I shall never again believe. There is only murder and pain, trouble and misery and there is no beauty. Jews killed and being killed, prayers gone unheeded, hatred

everywhere for the Jew. "A time to love, and a time to hate; a time of war, and a time of peace." Why must it be so?

She sat in the chair by the window in her room, surrounded by memories. The crest of gentiles weaving through the air. 'Jews Killed.' Saturday and the purge still on.

I am this girl who is now gone and dead in the vision of myself and I am now, this second, in this sunny room and a blue sky deep, covering the earth, this second, the girl gone and lost. All that I know is that we know nothing, and recall everything. I am breathing and am not yet grieved by the nature of my breathing. I am only saddened by the people of the earth. . . .

Proust and the Dreyfus Case

By HARRY SALPETER

NO SOCIALLY-MINDED JEW, no Jew who is merely informed in problems that concern his people, has to learn from literature the importance of such a phenomenon as the Dreyfus case, but the intensity with which the literature of Dreyfus' time reflects "the Case" gives us subsidiary notions of the force with which it impinged upon areas from which we might have assumed it to be remote.

Marcel Proust's incredible memoir in novel form, *Remembrance of Things Past*, drags its serpentine length through thousands of pages, and the subtlety of its psychological perception has been the occasion and the source of wonder of many other thousands of commentators' pages. It has many themes, but perhaps the most dominant of them is the interpenetration by the climbing bourgeoisie of nineteenth century France of that declining nobility in whose blue-blooded eyes even Napoleonic nobility was parvenu. It is the story of a social rise and fall captured in a style that is one of the most difficult and yet one of the most rewarding in which literature ever has been created.

With the important exception which is the occasion of this article, it is a social chronicle which is not rooted in a chronological conception of time. It is a dateless tale. The time has to be surmised from certain keys whose significance may escape the reader who has not been supplied by commentary with a social Rosetta stone. Yet, among all the topical references in the *Remembrance*, there is no one group that more clearly anchors this structure to its time than do the

references to the Dreyfus case, especially in that volume known as *The Guermentes Way*.

To take note that even in these days of wholesale slaughter of Jews, the Dreyfus case remains the symbol of legally formulated injustice to the individual Jew is not only to note again the scale of Alfred Dreyfus' symbolic, if involuntary, value to the Jew, but also to borrow a light from the present with which to illuminate the significance of Dreyfus and his "case" even to the most aloof exquisites of that period in which both the Jewish captain and the Jewish novelist were contemporaries.

How badly Proust himself misread the import, or, as we might say today, the "social significance," of the case appears in one of the early, almost faint, references to Dreyfus in *Within a Budding Grove*, the volume preceding *The Guermentes Way*. In a passage that bears upon Madame Swann's efforts to break into the selecter circles, he discusses French society as a kaleidoscope, whose elements not being immovable, is subject to successive turns, as a result of which fresh patterns are composed, being produced by changes in criterion.*

The Dreyfus case brought about another [turn], at a period rather later than that in which I began to go to Madame Swann's, and the kaleidoscope scattered once again its little scraps of colour. Everything Jewish . . . fell out of the pattern, and various obscure nationalities appeared in its place. The most brilliant drawing-room in Paris was that of a Prince who was an Austrian and ultra-Catholic. If instead of the Dreyfus case there had come a war with

* All quotations are, naturally, from the translations of C. K. Scott-Moncrieff.

Germany, the base of the kaleidoscope would have been turned in the other direction, and its pattern reversed. The Jews having shewn to the general astonishment, that they were patriots also, would have kept their position, and no one would have cared to go any more, or even to admit that he had ever gone, to the Austrian Prince's.

If even a trained observer notes only the casual effects of a summer shower within a particularly devastating thunderstorm, that is due not so much to the defect of his observation, as it is to the sheltered vantage point from which he is enabled to survey the minor part of the wreckage. It is quite possible that even up to the time of his death, in 1922, despite certain circumstances in his own experience, Proust chose to regard the Dreyfus case as the cause of a slight and temporary dislocation in Society, for, as Lewis Galantière informs us in his preface to the Modern Library Edition of *Swann's Way*, Proust was Society's "pet Jew," whose "verbal gaiety" and sensibility, among other qualities and distinctions, put him far out of the danger of being either snubbed or patronized "by the otherwise measurelessly insolent" families in whose homes he was a constant visitor. That Proust, like the Charles Swann into whom he poured so much of himself, was wealthy was a most minor distinction in a set in which the Rothschilds were looked upon as insufferable parvenues and in which the hushed references of the playwright Bloch to Sir Rufus Israels (intended, I suppose, to represent Sir Rufus Isaacs, who became Lord Reading) are met with ill-concealed sneers.

It is through the lips of Palamède de Charles, sinister, pathetic, insufferably insolent and exquisitely refined invert, that Proust gives expression to the ultimate "logic" of French insularity in anti-Semitism. This is that fine, and decadent, flower of French nobility (presumably constructed out of Proust's acquaintance with Count Robert de Montesquiou, also an invert) who, sneer-

ing at a mere Prince, declared that that was the title one might adopt were one planning to travel incognito. Indeed, so extreme is the Baron Charlus' contempt that one wonders whether an earthy anti-Dreyfus passion would not have been a lesser evil. When the narrator, who is Proust, tells the Baron that his friend Bloch is French, you can almost sense the shock with which he is thrown back upon his heels with the remark, "Indeed, I took him to be a Jew," compounding the sense of outrage by continuing, in apparent defense of Dreyfus against the charge of treason:

I understand the newspapers to say that Dreyfus has committed a crime against his country—so I understand, I pay no attention to the newspapers, I read them as I wash my hands, without finding that it is worth my while to take any interest in what I am doing. In any case, the crime is non-existent, your friend's compatriot would have committed a crime if he had betrayed Judaea, but what has he to do with France? I pointed out that if there should be a war the Jews would be mobilised just as much as anyone else. Perhaps so, and I am not sure that it would not be an imprudence. If we bring over Senegalese and Malagasies, I hardly suppose their hearts will be in the task of defending France, which is only natural. Your Dreyfus might rather be convicted of a breach of the laws of hospitality. But we need not discuss that—

dismissing Dreyfus with an insolent request for an invitation to a Temple festival when an exotic entertainment, such as a circumcision, might be on the program.

Perhaps such extremity of passion cancels itself into impotence up to the time that it can be implemented through economic and political power. The more politically effective anti-Semites do not move beyond the point at which they continue to embrace their best Jewish friends and pronounce distinctions between good and bad Jews. Swann sees this, when, meeting Proust at the Duc de Guermantes', he discusses with him the anti-Semitism of this noble family. When Proust asks why they are anti-Dreyfusards, Swann replies "because at

heart all these people are anti-semites," an obvious explanation which Proust discreetly rejects because, as he sees it, Swann's attribution of anti-Semitism in all the family spares him (Swann) the necessity of arguing on Dreyfus' behalf. To conceal his shade of difference of opinion, Proust pretends to confirm Swann's blanket indictment by reference to the most absolute anti-Semite, the Prince de Guermantes, and Swann wisely replies:

'Oh, that fellow! I wasn't even thinking about him. He carries it to such a point that when he was in the army and had a frightful toothache he preferred to grin and bear it rather than go to the only dentist in the district, who happened to be a Jew, and later on he allowed a wing of his castle which had caught fire to be burned to the ground, because he would have had to send for extinguishers to the place next door which belongs to the Rothschilds.'

And yet even in the home of this Prince, whose steel rigidity of anti-Semitic principle was impervious to appeal for any exception, Swann was socially acceptable in the mistaken belief that Swann's grandmother, a Protestant married to a Jew, had been mistress to the Duc de Berri, who thus became the father of Swann's father, making Charles a Christian throughout, an error of social belief which his later physiognomy reduced to ridicule.

In the novelist's notations on the manner in which the Dreyfus case acted upon Swann, Proust gives us, in the microcosm of an individual, a clear idea of how "the Case" divided French society on its upper levels even when, for himself, he appears to smile condescendingly at Swann's over-simplifying ardors. Although there was much of himself in Swann, the latter is, in part, the sublimation of another "pet Jew," one Charles Haas, a Parisian boulevardier who was charming and popular in what are known as the better circles. (Incidentally, *Remembrance of Things Past* is a rarity in that the novelist, in his own person,

mingles with presumably fictitious characters.)

Proust regards the new Swann with a feeling of mingled admiration and ridicule; admiration, in that, having the courage of an integrating conviction, he returned to the ways in which his forbears had trodden and from which he had turned aside to mingle with the aristocracy; ridicule, for being so comically blind that "he subjected afresh all his admirations and all his contempts to the test of a new criterion, Dreyfusism." Thus, Clemenceau, whom, previously, he had regarded as an English spy, accepting as truth the slanders of the aristocracy whom he had earlier cultivated, was now a man of conscience; thus, a Mme. Bontemps, whom he had earlier looked upon as an intelligent woman, now, as an anti-Dreyfusard, becomes a fool. It almost pains Proust to report that even Swann's literary sense had become chained to the chariot of his political conscience, for he withdrew from Barrès the praise which he had given him and bestowed it upon Clemenceau. With such intensity did Swann integrate his moral forces to pitch them into the battle for Dreyfus that the cause may be said to have brought about a corresponding change in his appearance, notably in his nose, from which, the flesh falling away, it suggested rather an old Hebrew prophet than a dilettante Valois. "Perhaps too in him, in these last days," the passage in the succeeding volume, *Cities of the Plain*, continues, "the race was making appear more pronounced the physical type that characterises it, at the same time as the sentiment of a moral solidarity with the rest of the Jews, a solidarity which Swann seemed to have forgotten throughout his life, and, which, one after another, his mortal illness, the Dreyfus case and the anti-semitic propaganda had revived."

Without clearly asserting that such re-orientation on Swann's part was an expression of a reflex induced by a sense

of persecution, Proust made note, as an objective umpire, of the absurd extreme to which the "logic" of anti-Dreyfusism drove the nationalists and clericals; and I suspect that if he did not say the French equivalent of "a plague on both your houses!" it was because he thought that the controversy added a touch of vitality to the social scene. Such, at least, is the impression created by his Olympian prose, which only goes to show what a wide gap lies between the man and the artist, for in the opening section of *Cities of the Plain*, in one of his minor parentheses, he refers to the "more than one duel" in which he engaged "without fear at the time of the Dreyfus case," thus showing how far toward absolute anti-Semitism we have travelled since those innocent, amateurish days when a Jew was permitted to defend his honor with a sword! Henri Bergson, the aged and venerable philosopher, who was related to Proust and who had the gilded youth as a student in his class at the Lycée Condorcet, may have reflected upon those early days almost as the golden age of anti-Semitism, as he stood in line at his neighborhood police station to register as a Jew and nominate himself for the Star of David.

Between the first volume of *The Guermantes Way* and of *Cities of the Plain* (I refer of course to the divisions in the English translation) the changing fate of Dreyfus is reflected in the mirror of Proust's social chronicle. But long before we can reach that happy foreshadowing of Dreyfus' liberation from Devil's Island and his rehabilitation which are provisioned in the soul-shaking doubts concerning his "guilt" which agitate that invincible fortress of anti-Semitism, the mind of the Prince de Guermantes—long before this, Proust gently lifts the curtain on the unsavory spectacle of the social-climbing Jew evading his responsibility to justice either by appearing to join in the cry against Dreyfus, or, at best, (for

him) by restraining the impulse to leap to his defense.

Mme. Swann, seeing the dimensions that the Dreyfus case had begun to assume, and fearing that her husband's racial origin might be used against herself, had besought him never again to allude to the prisoner's innocence. When he was not present she went farther and used to profess the most ardent Nationalism; in doing which she was only following the example of Mme. Verdurin, in whom a middle-class anti-semitism, latent hitherto, had awakened and grown to a positive fury. Mme. Swann had won by this attitude the privilege of membership in several of the women's leagues that were beginning to be formed in anti-semitic society, and had succeeded in making friends with various members of the aristocracy.

The irony of Mme. Swann's use of anti-Semitism in social climbing is the more clearly brought home when it is realized that in this passage we catch her mid-way in her career, between her less reputable existence as the notorious Odette de Crècy, who, before her marriage to Swann, was no better than an elegant prostitute, in marrying whom Swann had lost standing, and, toward the end, that socially triumphant Mme. Swann, whose salon, graced by the distinguished author, Bergotte, became the cynosure of the highest fashion in Paris, with the very society that once had snubbed Odette now courting her. (Could the Mme. de Caillavet who built a salon around Anatole France have been borrowed for a limb of this portrait? It is highly likely.) Between the Odette of *Swann's Way* and the Mme. Swann of *Cities of the Plain* supervene not merely more than 2,000 pages, but a revolution in French society, of which Proust became the most complete and the most sensitive reporter. And in the crucible in which this revolution took place, the Dreyfus case was an element in the solution.

Both the Duchesse de Guermantes and the Baron Charlus (the pathos of whose arrogance is yet to be made explicit by the later revelation of his ruling passion) seem to be aware of the manner in which class and family distinctions are being

weakened by the Dreyfus agitation. The Duchesse says the case can't make any difference to her because she doesn't know any Jews anyway and proposes to remain "in that state of blissful ignorance," and continues:

"But on the other hand I do think it perfectly intolerable that just because they're supposed to hold 'sound' views and don't deal with Jewish tradesmen, or have 'Down with the Jews' printed on their sunshades, we should have a swarm of Durands and Dubois and so forth, women we never should have known but for this business, forced down our throats," and refers to a relative in whose home she used to enjoy herself: "It used to be so nice there. Nowadays one finds all the people one has spent one's life trying to avoid, on the pretext that they're against Dreyfus, and others of whom you have no idea who they can be." The Baron puts it more bluntly:

All this Dreyfus business has only one drawback. It destroys society . . . by the influx of Mr. and Mrs. Camel and Camelries and Camel-yards, astonishing creatures whom I find even in the houses of my own cousins, because they belong to the Patrie Francaise, or the Anti-Jewish, or some such league, as if a political opinion entitled one to any social qualification.

And so it goes. The Mme. de Mar-santes, in whose anti-Dreyfusard home the Duchesse can no longer enjoy herself because of the interjection of politics, holds forth against the Lady Israels, but her own son, Robert de Saint Loup-en-Bray, nephew to Charlus and Prince de Guermantes, on the very eve of his election to the Jockey Club, of which his father had been chairman for ten years, announces rabid Dreyfusard opinions, endangering his place in society and throwing his family into confusion. Not a very significant example of noblesse oblige or of youthful radicalism, for by the time the likelihood of Dreyfus' probable innocence has penetrated the thick-nesses of the upper crust (some 500 pages or more further on) and even the Guer-

mantes clan is ready to beat a strategic retreat, Robert throws over "the Case," more or less out of sheer boredom.

But Saint Loup, as Gentile Frenchman rather than as ducal Guermantes, was not so rare a bird in the Dreyfus camp as was Swann, the wealthy and fashionable and socially entrenched part-Jew. For explicit chronicle we must go outside Proust. The lash with which Max Nordau, in his address at the Second Zionist Congress at Basle August 28, 1898, belabored the Jews of France for their cowardly abstention from self-defense and the defense of Dreyfus, gives us more than a clue to the situation of which Saint Loup and Swann are the convenient symbols. Not only, cried out Nordau, did not Jews fail to protest against the most elementary violations of justice in the case, not only did they leave it to Christians to accomplish "this duty of honour," to take up "the cudgel for right," making but a shameful spectacle against "the long file of Christian heroes who staked their fortunes, their freedom, their civic honour, their life in the struggle for a right which was only in a very abstract, very elevated, very idealistic sense, their right"—but

Jewish names on the contrary, which I do not care to bring over my lips because they corrode my tongue like sulphuric acid and bile, Jewish names are to be found in fearfully large numbers among the literary brigands who attacked Zola and his fighting companions, and it was a Jew who uttered the horrid words: 'Whether Dreyfus be innocent or guilty, we do not want to hear anything of him, we do not admit the revision of his case.'

With more restrained, almost with pity-ing contempt, did Nordau, the following year, speak of those "Jewish *Tartuffes* of fashionable society" and of what they suffered "to squeeze into anti-Semitic circles," "To dance at a ducal ball, or to be allowed even to lend money to an indigent Count." Nordau had read about these Jews in the books of Anatole France and of others; Proust knew them intimately. What illumination Nordau might

not have been able to borrow from Proust had they ever met!

In "The Unbearable Bassington" by Saki (H. H. Monro) the English wit who died early in the First World War, there is a little dialogue.

'You are not very fond of the Jews,' said Elaine.

'I've travelled and lived a good deal in Eastern Europe,' said Youghal.

'It seems largely a question of geography,' said Elaine, 'in England no one really is anti-Semitic.'

Youghal shook his head. 'I know a great many Jews who are.'

The passage in which the Duc de Guermantes, (in *Cities of the Plain*) conversing with General de Froberville, reproves Swann—"an epicure, a man of practical judgment, a collector who goes in for old books, a member of the Jockey, a man who enjoys the respect of all that know him, who knows all the good addresses, and used to send us the best port wine you could wish to drink, a dilettante, the father of a family"—for espousing Dreyfusard sentiments, even though he may feel them, is a curious revelation of the workings of a socially insulated mind, for whom the command of conscience has no validity against the claims of gratitude for having been received in the Faubourg Saint-Germain. "Don't you see," he continues, trying to sound reasonable and unanswerable, "even from the point of view of his beloved Jews, since he is absolutely determined to stand by them, Swann has made a blunder of an incalculable magnitude. He has shown that they are to some extent forced to give their support to any one of their own race, even if they do not know him personally. It is a public danger." And in this, the fictional M. de Guermantes, has stated the very real, and unfictional, reasoning of the inner anti-Semitic citadel, reasoning by which Jews always have been intimidated and by which they have allowed themselves to be cut up into ideological fractions on every issue

which touches them, either as Jews or as citizens.

This does not prepare us for the dénouement conveyed in the astonishing confession which the Prince de Guermantes, that last word in absolute anti-Semitism, makes to Swann and which Swann, deeply moved, reports to the narrator, Proust himself, at that magnificent ducal party which Proust spends so many pages of the first volume of "Cities of the Plain" in describing. That the prince, who can accept Swann only on the fictitious ground that he is an illegitimate Valois, should make this confession of error, explains how, in spite of everything, justice had at least the fighting chance in France of righting a wrong.

Well, as the Prince tells Swann, he has learned from several conversations with General Beaucerfeuil that "there had been culpable intrigues, that the *bordereau* was possibly not in Dreyfus' writing, but that an overwhelming proof of his guilt did exist. This was the Henry document. And a few days later we learned that it was a forgery." Secretly, he begins reading *Siècle* and *Aurore*, Dreyfusard papers, which, no less secretly, the Princess, his wife, also has been reading. The very Abbé to whom he takes his doubts is a Dreyfusard and when he begs him to say masses "for the intention of Dreyfus, his unfortunate wife and their children," he learns that the Princess also has ordered masses, which take precedence over his own. Even the Duc de Guermantes becomes a raving Dreyfusard, after meeting, at a spa, an Italian Princess and her two sisters-in-law, who charmingly cut the ground from under his feet, and leave him no choice, on the level of reasoning, but to discard opinions which they can so smilingly and so thoroughly disprove. Of course from now on, so far as the Proustian chronicle is concerned, the restoration of Dreyfus is un fait accompli.

One thing Swann will not do. He will not allow the more impulsive Bloch to

appeal to the Prince to sign a petition on Dreyfus' behalf, nor will he himself sign any paper which reflects upon the probity of the French army, of which he wears the ribbon of a Chevalier of the Legion of Honor. It is with the honors due this rank that, in his will, he requests burial in the church at Combray, hoping, to the last, not to die until Dreyfus is rehabilitated and Piquart is made a Colonel. Beyond which, for our purposes, we do not have to follow Proust.

In a recently published work, *The Germans and the Jews*, the author, F. R. Bienenfeld, spends part of a chapter describing the ways in which Jews differ

from one another, documenting the cries of Jewish leaders who have always bewailed the divisive tendencies in Jewry. Mr. Bienenfeld refers to an Hungarian Jew of his acquaintance, a super-patriot, who welcomed the advent of Hitler, because through Hitler, the injustice done to Hungary, in the treaty of Trianon would be righted. "In the Dreyfus affair," adds Mr. Bienenfeld, "the only supporter of Dreyfus who shared all the prejudices of the military caste and of the anti-Dreyfus party, was none other than Captain Dreyfus himself." Which is the curdled cream of the bitter jest that was enacted against him.

THE RABBI

By Sergeant HAROLD APPLEBAUM

Exalted by the love of God, this man
Goes forth among his friends, a gentle king
Too wise to rule. When first I came to stand
Before him, awed at what a sacred thing
It was to be confirmed, I could but think,
How great a man, how tall, how nobly wise,
How finely did he speak, and I did drink
His words and love the splendour of his eyes.

When next we met, I faced him to be wed.
But now I saw he was not great, nor tall,
And I had learned myself the words he said,
But on his face he wore the prayers of all,
And in his eyes he bore with sorrow'd grace
The deathless patience of his deathless race.

Joseph Albo: Thinker and Prophet

On the Occasion of His Five Hundredth Anniversary

By JACOB S. MINKIN

IN TIMES less sad and tragic than the present the five hundredth anniversary of the death of Joseph Albo would be observed with impressive ceremonies. Learned bodies would meet, scholarly articles would be written, and his life and work would be memorialized in a solemn and becoming manner. For he was indeed a striking figure, the last of a great line of scholars, the most popular, even if not one of the greatest, of the Jewish thinkers of the Spanish school, a lover of his people, a defender of his faith, a torch for his generation, and, regardless of his age, a pillar of light and guidance in the trials and perplexities of our own time.

Jewish philosophy which rose so brilliantly in Mohammedan lands, suffered a fatal lapse. Under the impact of Christianity, Jewish life was crumbling almost everywhere. Two hundred years after the death of Moses Maimonides hardly anything was left of Jewish creativity. Spent and exhausted by ceaseless strife and persecution, minds devoted to poetry, philosophy, and the sciences began to look around for some other means of self-preservation. They found it in the Talmud which gave them the stability and balance they so sorely needed.

The story began in Germany, the classical land of Jewish suffering, when the crusades and the Black Death unleashed against the Jews an epidemic of human brutality equalled only by what is happening in our own days. But it did not stop there, for soon it crossed over to Spain where conditions arose more and more resembling those in Germany. The

whole country was seized with terror; the plague spared neither palace nor hovel, and to propitiate an angry deity, a holy war was declared against the Jews. Fanatical priests and flagellant monks excited the terrified population to frenzied persecutions. Scourging, singing, and carrying before them gleaming crosses, they fell upon the most thickly populated Jewish communities in Castile and Aragon, looting, pillaging, murdering, offering baptism as their only alternative.

The Jews displayed that blind heroism which appears throughout their whole history from the days of Nebuchadnezzar and Titus down to the latest victims of the Polish ghettos. Thousands preferred death to baptism, and rather than betray their religion submitted themselves to slaughter either at the swords of the enemy or at their own hand. But thousands of others, either exhausted by prolonged resistance to persecution or because their frightful suffering had made them doubt the enduring value of their religion, availed themselves of the alternative and accepted baptism. The fury of the fray bore its fruit; to what extent no one knows, but there must have been tens of thousands who went over to the Church.

Thus, in less than half a century, intellectual and spiritual gains were wiped out which took generations to accumulate. The final close of the Spanish episode was not to come for another fifty years, but it was really long before then that the intellectual career of the Spanish Jews had ceased to exist. The decline was rapid, and it went at a quickened pace. Their

light faded and they could no longer stimulate Jewish life as they had done before. Poetry died, the sciences languished, biblical studies were neglected, and the disputatious philosophers were forgotten in the face of the surrounding dangers. A people fighting for its life, fighting with every inadequate weapon at its command, had no need of these things; indeed, they were in its way. What it needed was something far more prosaic—a technique to hold them together that they might not be lost, and this they found in their religion, or in their national tradition—the Talmud.

Joseph Albo, whose book *Sefer-ha-Ikkarim*, Book of Principles, persisted through half a millenium to become a Jewish folk-classic, was perhaps not the most original thinker of the Spanish school. The Jewish philosophic genius manifested itself in profounder and more independent minds than his. Indeed, with the death of Hasdai Crescas, whose classroom discussions Albo is said by Dr. Harry Wolfson to have repeated, there was a pause in Jewish philosophy which was not broken for more than two hundred and fifty years. Philosophy was ill-adapted to times which called for steadfastness and loyalty rather than abstract thinking. Oppression and gloom had done their dismal work, and instead of aspiring to new heights of the spirit, Israel retired behind the citadel of tradition. In contrast to the erstwhile liberality of the Jewish spirit, Jewish teachings became more fixed and formulated, and greater store was set by observance and obedience than by free and untrammelled speculations. Nevertheless, Joseph Albo must be given credit for having been among the foremost of his race to have blended philosophy with religion, indeed, to have made them identical. In the words of his biographer and exponent, S. Black, "He not only invested Judaism with a philosophic foundation, but endowed philosophy with a preeminently religious content."

Sefer ha-Ikkarim, the book by which Joseph Albo became famous, is not so much a bold thrust into the philosophical stratosphere as a restatement of the views and opinions of his predecessors, not so much an independent and novel contribution as a presentation in brief crisp capsule form of the principal religious teachings of the Jewish religion. Indeed, as shown by Dr. Isaac Husik, philosophy was not Albo's forte, nor was it his chief concern. Many of the doubts and perplexities which arose in the minds of Jews had been, if not completely solved, at least discussed by the Jewish philosophers from the time of Saadia down to Hasdai Crescas, his teacher. They had been abundantly argued, debated, and written about by greater and stronger minds than his. What he aimed at was to give his people something which in their desperate condition they sorely needed—the quintessence of Judaism, its leading teachings and tenets in a brief and unadorned manner which might help them in their struggle for spiritual existence.

The formulation of the teachings of Judaism in sharp and fixed sentences, it must be remembered, was born of the Jewish struggle for self-maintenance. When the Jews were an independent people and the Jewish religion followed its own free and unhampered existence there was no need of reducing their teachings to fixed forms and principles. Indeed, Jewish teachers from the days of the prophets down to the destruction of the Jewish state, looked askance at any such attempt, regarding it, as it were, as an offense against the sovereignty of the human mind. Thus, there is no suggestion of creeds in the Bible, and in the Talmud only the faintest trace of their presence may be discerned. And, indeed, what room could there be for vital concepts of a religion in which every letter and word of the Torah was regarded as equally important and binding on the believer?

In Judaism, therefore, articles of faith

had never acquired that authority and importance they exercised in other religions, as in Christianity and Islam, for instance. They never became conditions of salvation which if one rejected them he had nothing. While the Rabbis enumerated the religious precepts of Judaism as 613, "Thou shalt believe" is not one of them. The ethos of Israel is realistic; it seeks to curb the evil instinct rather than enforce belief. If, therefore, broadly speaking, one is to search Judaism for its fundamental tenets one is more likely to find them in pious conduct rather than in abstract belief.

Then, again, religious dogmas obtained no such sovereignty in Jewish life as they did in other religions because the synagogue lacked the power and instrumentality to enforce them. Of what avail would it be to legislate inviolable principles when there was no ecclesiastical or state authority to look after their obedience? There were no popes, no bishops, no community councils to carry them into effect. Even when, from time to time, such authoritative bodies did arise, as, for instance, the Men of the Great Assembly, and later, the Sanhedrin, they were not vested with power in matters of faith. They could only penalize those who denied but they could not declare or legislate what to believe.

It was only when Judaism came into contact with alien influences on the one hand and religion became a matter of knowledge instead of a matter of faith on the other hand, that the Jewish struggle for existence began and the need was felt for the establishment of rigid and uncompromising articles of faith. When Rabbinism was challenged by Karaism, when, first Islam and then Christianity, engaged Jews in religious disputations and called upon them to vindicate their faith, then the need arose for a precise and conceptional determination of the basic creed of the synagogue. It was then, and not until then, that, in the confusion of the times and the dismal condition of

their life, the necessity not infrequently arose for short, sharp and well-construed sentences in which the principal doctrines of Judaism would be summed up and which might be more conveniently handed down. "My heart sickens to see the belief of my co-religionists impure and their theological views confused," writes Rab Saadia Gaon, and he proceeded to clarify the confusion by constructing a number of articles of the Jewish faith, an attempt that was followed by other Jewish thinkers from Moses Maimonides down to Joseph Albo.

In less than one hundred years of their formulation, the Thirteen Articles of Moses Maimonides became the accepted creed of the synagogue, were embodied in its ritual, and although frowned upon by critics, were almost universally acknowledged. Poets made them the subject of rhymed songs, and numerous homilies and commentaries were written on them. But soon conditions arose which made them burdensome, even dangerous, to the people that received them with enthusiasm. The Jewish center of gravity was shifted from Mohammedan to Christian lands. To further conversion, Church dignitaries forced Jews to accept the challenge of religious disputations. It was a pious fraud, of course, but a fraud which invariably succeeded, for no matter who won in the verbal contest, the Jew always paid both with his life and his faith. It was thus that the Church was enriched, although in most cases it was only mock conversion that she received for all her pains. Joseph Albo figured as a participant in one such disputation, the famous Disputation of Tortosa, the greatest and longest of them all, which, with interruptions, lasted nearly two years, from 1413 to 1414.

Under the conditions the Jews were called upon to face, the Thirteen Articles of Maimonides were not a help to them but a hindrance, if not a positive danger. Without them they could evade or parry the Christian attack, but how could they

disclaim giving offense to the regnant faith when Maimonides made the immutability of the Law and the coming of the Messiah—in reverse the very corner stones of the Christian Church—fundamental doctrines of the synagogue? Later philosophers had not proved any more helpful. In their hands the dogmas obscured rather than clarified the cardinal teachings of Judaism. Highly contested individual opinions were set down as creeds, so that they bewildered instead of crystalized the clear expression of Judaism.

Seeing, therefore, the confusion that existed among the philosophers on the principles of the Jewish religion and their identity, Joseph Albo found that there were three essentials from which no revealed religion can deviate. They are the Existence of God, Providence, and Reward and Punishment after death. These *Ikkarim*, or principles, do not, however, exhaust the credal content of Judaism, for from them issue, like branches from the stem of a tree, *Shorashim*, derivatives, which it is incumbent upon every religionist, and particularly upon every Jew, to believe if he is not to make himself guilty of heresy. Albo enumerates eight such *Shorashim* which he reckons to be vital to Judaism if the believer is to share in the world to come.

However, the novelty of Albo's doctrine consists in the still other division into which he classifies the beliefs and teachings of Judaism. For Joseph Albo was surprisingly a liberal thinker, in many respects centuries ahead of his time. He was far ahead of the legalists of his time, generations in advance of the men of his age who regarded with awe and demanded inflexible obedience to every letter and precept of the Torah. On the contrary, Joseph Albo took an almost startlingly modern view of the Torah, a view which not only in his day, but even today would seem curious if not heretical. Thus, in his broad survey of the religious content of Judaism, he found

that it was heavily brocaded with precepts and ordinances not necessarily vital to the genius and teachings of the Jewish religion, observances and practices which may confer happiness upon the pious, but the neglect of which does not place one outside the Jewish community or impede his progress toward religious perfection. Indeed, his interpretation of the religious requirements of Judaism was so broad and liberal, that under his doctrine it would be difficult to impugn the orthodoxy of even the most liberal. The minor customs and traditions, which abound in every religion, he called *Anafim*, or twigs, which though they embellish a tree and make it look beautiful, yet do not affect it. They may wither and die or may be removed by human hands without doing serious harm to the trunk of the tree itself. "Likewise," he says, "a person who violates a commandment of the Torah is called a transgressor, and is liable to the penalty prescribed in the Torah for that commandment, but he is not excluded from those who profess the Torah, and is not regarded as a denier of the Torah who has no share in the world to come."

It has become customary among his critics to belittle Joseph Albo's standing as a philosopher and to place his book far below similar works of other men. But the credit cannot be denied him of having been a great and in many respects an original thinker. He was a man of a great diversity of gifts and talents. The breadth and variety of the genius of Spanish Jewry is exhibited in him as in few other men. He was daring and courageous and one must marvel at the freedom with which he criticised the views and opinions of his predecessors, especially Moses Maimonides. He distilled the wisdom of his ill-fated age and presented it in a form that was both fluent and eloquent. He was the first of Jewish philosophers to classify law as natural, conventional, and divine and to invent a philosophical terminology all his own. If he leaned heavily upon his predecessors,

it was as often to reject as to accept their views.

His book proves that its author was a matured and well-informed man who read widely and wisely, thoroughly at home in the subject which he treats, and if sometimes diffuse, never obscure or unintelligible. Few other men show such intimacy with the philosophical currents of his time and those of previous generations. He was familiar with the principal works of the classical Greek and Arabic thinkers, and as to the Jewish philosophers, hardly anything they taught escaped him. Plato, Aristotle, Euclid, and Hippocrates figure largely in his pages, as do also Ibn Sina, Ibn Roshad, and Algazali among the Arab philosophers. There is no better and more complete appraisal of the philosophical speculations of Jewish thinkers than one finds in Albo's *Sefer ha-Ikkarim*. One finds the most hallowed names in his procession, from Rab Saadia down to Hasdai Crescas. He shows considerable acquaintance with the Kabbalah, which in his day excited almost sensational interest, and quotes the Zohar on several occasions, although, as one might have expected of a philosopher, warning against the indiscriminate acceptance of its doctrine.

But what is particularly surprising, is his expert knowledge of Christianity, his familiarity with the New Testament, and his more than superficial acquaintance with Christian Church theology, a field in which he may be said to have excelled many another Jewish philosophical writer. From a man who joined in the Judeo-Christian controversies of his time and represented his community at the Tortosa Disputation one might expect some acquaintance with the theological teachings of his opponents. But his knowledge of the religious teachings of the dominant faith was more thorough and complete than that. He displays a familiarity and depth of insight which is astounding for a man who was a rabbi and a Talmudist and whose whole life was devoted to the

sacred lore of his own people. Besides casual references to the New Testament found scattered in all the four parts of his book, he devotes more than twenty-five pages to a refutation of Christian doctrine in the third part of his work alone. One must indeed marvel at his erudition; more than that, one must admire his courage in criticising the fundamental teachings of the regnant faith when to do so was to invite the displeasure of the all-powerful Church.

To explain Albo's philosophy a whole treatise would be necessary. In the present paper one must content oneself with a few brief notes on the characteristic features of his teaching as they affect or perhaps influenced current Jewish thinking. For, with the exception of Maimonides and Halevi, he was the most widely-read Jewish philosopher, and is it not likely that the tenor of Jewish thought was in some measure determined by this sage of Soria?

Writers on Joseph Albo do not classify him as a rationalist. Indeed, the rationalist school of medieval Jewish philosophers is said to have come to a brilliant climax in the work of Moses Maimonides. But there are flashes in *Sefer ha-Ikkarim* which remind one of the noblest representatives of that school, flashes which, considering the time and environment in which he lived, seem surprisingly modern. Indeed, one is led to feel that while Albo was affected by his time, he looked far beyond his time.

The open-mindedness of Albo was indeed remarkable. It is one of the outstanding qualities of his work. While he believed in revelation and was devoted to the Torah, he was at the same time one of the stoutest defenders of the sovereignty of human reason. There is in his work no enslavement of the human mind, no shackling of the intellect, no blind adherence to the traditional concepts of Judaism. Thus in one of the surprising illuminating passages in his work, he makes himself responsible for the dar-

ing statement, "For the Torah does not oblige us to believe in absurdities, nor put our faith in anything reason cannot conceive. . . . Absurd ideas, therefore, which cannot be conceived by the mind need not be believed even if it is plainly expressed in the Torah." One is not surprised that he met with opposition during his life and was the subject of much bitter criticism long after he had died. For much milder utterances men were charged with heresy and were roundly abused and persecuted by their contemporaries.

Albo was on the side of free discussion of religion, even to the point of questioning the validity of one's faith and how it squared with the doctrines of other creeds. He quotes Maimonides for his support, who, in the Guide of the Perplexed says that it behooves every man to investigate the religion he professes. Albo, of course, is so sure that in such investigation Judaism would come out triumphant that he entertains no fears on the subject; but the very fact that more than five hundred years ago he encouraged the critical study of religion is significant.

He even went further than that and declared himself in favor of a free interpretation of the tenets and doctrines of Judaism in accordance with the changing conditions of the times. For an illustration, and there is nothing in Albo that is not made crystal clear by a wealth of illustrations, he draws on his profession. The physician, he says, has to adapt his medicaments to the various stages through which his patient passes. That he changes his prescription does not, however, imply that his medical knowledge is imperfect, or that his earlier remedies were imperfectly chosen. The varying conditions of the invalid were the cause of the variation of the doctor's treatment. A daring doctrine, indeed, daring in some quarters even five hundred years after it had been uttered!

Joseph Albo was a man of warmth and

feeling. He beheld his generation struggling under a load which was crushing to many of them. Thousands despaired because, examining their religious conduct, they found that they were remiss in one of another of the divine commandments. Would they be saved? Would they attain to that state of spiritual perfection, or *hashlomat hanefesh* which, according to Albo, is the aim and purpose of religion? "If every one professing the Law of Moses must fulfil all the many commandments mentioned therein before he can attain any degree of future life, then the Law of Moses would hinder man from the acquisition of perfection rather than help him. . . . Human perfection may be attained by fulfilling even a single one of the commandments of the Law of Moses." And when a man's heart is that poor and humble that it can find nothing wherewith to merit heaven, it is enough if it merely abstains from doing what is evil. What a comforting doctrine, almost Hasidic in spirit, it must have been to the men and women of his time who, to escape persecution had to suffer many of the precepts of the Torah to go by the board!

In a supreme crisis in civilization like the present, when forces of evil have arisen to crush the worth and dignity of human personality, what better lesson can be pointed to than to listen to the kind and gentle teacher of Soria who, in words of solemn beauty, had taught: "Man has a human personality which is in the likeness of God. And therefore he must be careful not to disgrace it either in himself or in his neighbor, and he should see to it that it should survive death and unite with the celestial beings in that place from which it originally came. This is what Scripture metaphorically implies, 'In the day that God created man, in the likeness of God He made him.'"

What greater tribute could be laid at the feet of this preacher of goodwill and human cooperation of five hundred years

ago, than to say that at a time he beheld with his own eyes men flung to the flames for clinging to their religion, he taught the equality of all men and validity of all faiths if only they led to the moral and spiritual betterment of the believers? For this is what Albo actually says at the conclusion of the first part of his book: "This shows that there may be two or more divine laws existing at the same time among different nations, and that each one leads those who live by them to attain human happiness."

Albo's religion is a joyous and ecstatic faith, a rapturous absorption in God attained by means higher than human reason. But it is not the religion of the mystic who shuns and despises life. Indeed, he castigates severely those religious sects which would seek God along the parched roads of the denial of life. Living in an age when life was degraded and held cheap, Albo preached and affirmed life. No phrase occurs more frequently in his pages than *haslaha emushit*, human happiness. He refers to Kabbalah, but it is doubtful that he was ever one of its devotees.

Unfortunately, little is known of the personal life of Joseph Albo, if he had one besides the one that was merged with the community which he served as a kind friend, wise teacher, and noble guide. For Jewish scholars and thinkers had rarely enjoyed a private or individual life of their own. Their teachings radiated from a personality that was keenly aware of the needs of the people in whose midst they lived and whose lot, for the most part sad and tragic, they shared. Indeed, herein lies the secret of their greatness and the wondrous power of their hold and influence on their surroundings. They towered high above the other men of their generation not so much by what they wrote and taught as by what they were and did.

Not even the exact dates of his birth and death are established with any degree of certainty. Scholars are still in dis-

agreement about both. It is only by computations and deductions that we are led to surmise that he was born about the year 1380 and died about the year 1444, fourteen years after the completion of his book. From what little is known, he lived in Soria, Spain, where he exercised the functions of preacher and physician to his community. Judging by the style of his book, which is simple, direct, and fluent, containing a wealth of illustrations and allegorical interpretations of biblical and Talmudic texts, he must have been an exceedingly effective preacher, indeed. One can almost visualize his people inspired and uplifted by the gentleness of his tone, by the eloquence of his words, and the magic and warmth of his personality. For Joseph Albo was not a harsh teacher. One cannot conceive of him as a fanatic—he who had seen so much sorrow, so much suffering, and the tremendous burdens the humblest of his people had borne for his religion. Indeed, he asked for little; for what more could he ask of people who had already given so much? He was satisfied with a minimum of conformity, if only they kept what he considered the essentials of their religion.

His career came to a brilliant climax when, as a young man, he was summoned by his people to represent them at the celebrated Disputation of Tortosa. It was an honor, and a challenge, too; indeed, one of the gravest responsibilities that could come to a man so young—he was less than forty years old—for upon the issue of that debate depended everything the Jews of Spain held dear—their freedom, their religion, their very life. No record was kept of the famous disputation, or what record was kept has since been lost. We, therefore, do not know how Albo figured in the renowned verbal contest, what part he played, or how successfully he parried the attack of the adversary. But his part could not have been an undistinguished one, for he possessed many of the qualities necessary

for just such an exchange of wits. He was an excellent theologian acquainted with the teachings of both the Church and the synagogue, and courageous to the point of recklessness. We have referred to his intimate knowledge of the New Testament. But his acquaintance with Christian teachings went far beyond it, indeed, extending to the writings of the Church Fathers, for in at least one place in his book, he ventures to correct a mistranslation of a biblical verse by Jerome.

Little more is known about the composition of *Sefer ha-Ikkarim* than about the personal life of its author, except that it was completed in the year 1428, or fourteen years after the Disputation of Tortosa. It was written at a time when the Jewish world was in confusion, chaos and dissolution, when Spanish Jewry was living through its deepest martyrdom and events were shifting for its final tragedy. What survived the persecutions of Ferrand Martinez was overwhelmed by the terrors of Vincent Ferrer. Their inner light was all but extinguished, their outward life was all but destroyed, nothing of the fame and glory that was once Spanish Jewry was left. A people, a great people of poets, thinkers, and scientists, was making ready for the fate that had overtaken it throughout the centuries of its tragic history.

Albo's book senses the awaited doom, but he never once directly refers to it. He who had seen so much, felt so much, and experienced so much—the kind and gentle shepherd of his flock—neither laments nor mourns, but, instead, soothes, comforts, and consoles. Indeed, he never even mentions the clouds and storms through which he had passed. His faith is too strong and his confidence in Israel's destiny too great to be shaken by the passing events, no matter how grave and serious. It is with *Ikkarim*, principles, that he is concerned, not with the din and noise of a wicked world.

It would seem that the lay readers had a higher opinion of Joseph Albo's work

than had some of the professional philosophers, for while the latter patronized it, treated it almost with disdain, regarding it as a departure from the high intellectual level of the writer's predecessors, the former took kindly to it and made it their favorite classic. For no sooner was *Sefer ha-Ikkarim* made available to the general reading public than it became unusually popular. And this perhaps not so much because of its subject matter, as because of the brilliance of its style and its frequent use of stories and illustrations. Reading it one feels the exhilaration one experiences reading Rashi's commentary to the Bible or choice portions of the Midrash instead of the speculations of a philosopher. Preacher that the writer was and therefore unaccustomed to brevity, Albo is often long-winded, taking up whole chapters with what he might have condensed in a paragraph or two. But even so, he is seldom tiresome. If there are no new horizons in his book, one may always expect to be surprised by a new phrase, a subtle expression, a fresh turn of a word or an ingenious explanation of a biblical or Talmudic passage. It is this that gave Albo's book a popularity that was not enjoyed by the work of any other Jewish philosopher. Somehow, the plain and simple people sensed that in Joseph Albo they had a kind friend, a wise teacher, and pleasant companion.

Sefer ha-Ikkarim might have very well been concluded with the first part without any serious loss of its essential ideas. But, as the writer himself states, he was prevailed upon by friends further to clarify his views, which he did by adding three more parts to the original argument. The first edition of *Sefer ha-Ikkarim* appeared in Soncino in 1485, and was published with a commentary *Ohel Ya'akov*, by Jacob ben Samuel Koppelman ben Bunem, of Brzec.

Joseph Albo was the last bearer of a torch that was carried for more than a thousand years in Moslem and Christian

lands. With him the philosophical genius of the Jews, the genius that was fed from Jewish and not alien sources, may be said to have exhausted itself. Now and again it flickered dimly in isolated instances, in men such as Isaac Arama, author of the homiletical *Akedat Yizhak*, in Don Isaac Abraranel, and less clearly, in his son, Judah Leo Abraranel. It flickered, and sputtered, but its original strength was spent and gone. The ex-

pulsion from Spain, which came less than half a century after Albo had died, put an end to a tradition that was maintained for centuries and gave the Jews many of their most eminent men. One must, however, be grateful that before the flame had died down, it made a last effort to mount high again in the person of Joseph Albo who lived a life and bequeathed to us a book for which thousands blessed him.



Landless Peoples

IRVING KRIESBERG

NEW YORK NOTES

By VERO

WITH THE DAY of the final defeat of the Axis coming nearer and nearer, responsible American leaders are warning the nation that we must not lose the peace through the adoption of the Axis philosophy. Visiting Sydenham Hospital, which is situated in the Harlem district and takes care chiefly of Negroes, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt explained to reporters her definition of social equality by saying that it consists of what an individual enjoys among friends and is something that cannot be touched by legislation: "It is foolish for people to talk in general terms about social equality, because that is a thing to be dealt with on a personal basis and you can't legislate against that. But you can talk about the rights of citizens of the United States wherever they are."

The First Lady suggested as a possible solution to the Negro problem that populations be shifted so that there would be better balance and more integration, though it should be left to individual choice to decide who would move. She said: "I think we have made perhaps one mistake in the past with immigration into this country. We have let people settle into isolated groups that were all Swedish, or all Norwegian, so that they became little islands. What eventually happened was that it took longer to integrate into Americans."

In another part of the city, at Randall's Island, Assistant Secretary of State Berle addressed a *Journal-American* Inter-Faith Conference. Germany, aiming to capitalize on whatever evil instinct could

be aroused, tried to set faith against faith, race against race—in short, to "Balkanize this country," first, by stirring up hatred against Jews. Said Berle: "America united was unconquerable; but if America could be divided into minority groups, each inflamed against the other, then the U. S. might become weak or even powerless."

△ △ △

AT HUNTER COLLEGE the students have decided to work closely together for the victory of democracy. Their spiritual and social center is the Sarah Delano Roosevelt House, sponsored jointly by the Hillel Foundation, the Newman (Catholic) Club, and the College Protestant Association. Said Dr. H. M. Rosenthal, adviser of the Hillel Foundation: "Participation in inter-faith activities is a basic and necessary part of the struggle to perpetuate western culture and morality." The Protestant leader, Dr. Eleanor B. Marr, observed that the tone of the interfaith work at Roosevelt House is friendly and informal: "It doesn't seem healthy to force interfaith activities. People best grow in understanding gradually, and without pressure." Dr. Mae A. Burns described how her organization, the Newman Club, had adopted the motto of Cardinal Newman of the Catholic Church of England, "Heart to Heart Speaketh," as its guiding principle in its relationship with the other religious clubs of the Roosevelt House.

It should also be noted that members of the Catholic Teachers' Association of

New York and Brooklyn, the Protestant Teachers' Association, and the Jewish Teachers' Association recently organized here the Co-Ordinating Committee of Religious Associations, in order to develop a spirit of harmony and understanding among the city's religious groups.

△ △ △

BUT THERE ARE PEOPLE in the United States who, though they make believe that America is their first and last concern, don't give a damn about this country's principles. You remember that the American Legion, in a resolution adopted at its 26th convention held in Chicago, demanded, among other things, the deportation of all refugees from the U. S. immediately upon conclusion of the war. The closing of America's gate to "the hungry hordes of Europe" was urged by the Veterans of Foreign Wars as well as by the General Society of the War of 1812.

Thereupon the Jewish War Veterans saved the honor of America's veterans when their delegates to the forty-ninth National Encampment at the Hotel Commodore urged continuation of the present immigration laws. They are resolved that—

The traditional American policy of offering haven to newcomers from foreign lands be continued within the framework of our present immigration laws, so that the United States of America may continue to grow and prosper in the forefront of nations upholding democratic conditions, and so that the ideals of liberty and opportunity, toward which the United Nations are now heroically striving, may remain a living inspiration in the progress of mankind.

With reference to refugees we might mention a unique agency established in this city for information concerning dislocated Europeans, the Central Location Index, Inc., with Etta Deutsch as executive director. The speed of the work will depend upon cessation of military hostilities and elimination of the inevitable confusion, but the organization is geared to handle a case load of 2,500,000 names. For the benefit of persons here who are anxious to determine the whereabouts

of missing friends or relatives as soon as possible, Miss Deutsch said, searches might take several months to a year. In many instances, she declared, deaths in concentration camps meant that information about missing persons never would become available.

The director explained that while much of the information handled by her service would be in behalf of Jewish agencies, the index itself was a non-sectarian undertaking and would be used for inquiries forwarded by other than Jewish groups.

△ △ △

HATS OFF to Mr. Samuel E. Schneerson, campaign chairman of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies, who is also president of the Jewish Education Committee (succeeding Justice Samuel I. Rosenmann), and a trustee of Mt. Sinai Hospital and of the Jewish Theological Seminary. During the day he is active in the clothing industry as one of the city's leading businessmen, but in the evening he addresses one group after another in order to raise money for the noble cause. At a luncheon, held at the Hotel Commodore, he told the audience that the vast amount of shifting, tension, strain, and disruption of lives caused by reconversion and demobilization would throw a heavy burden on the welfare agencies: "Our 116 affiliated medical and social welfare agencies must be provided with the sinews of peace, as they were provided with the sinews of war." He pointed out that Federation agencies were already aiding returned veterans to solve family and other problems and helping dislocated industrial workers.

In this connection we might mention one of the institutions that has been greatly aided by the Federation, the famous Mount Sinai Hospital. Its post-war plans call for erection of a maternity pavilion and buildings to provide modern laboratories to guide therapy, for research into new medical fields, and for broader training of physicians. The build-

ings will house, among other things, a million-volt X-ray machine that promises new possibilities in the treatment of deep-seated tumors.

△ △ △

THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE expects henceforth to combat anti-Semitism "scientifically" and for that purpose appointed Dr. Max Horkheimer, noted sociologist and director of the Institute of Social Research at Columbia University, as Research Consultant in Domestic Defense for the Committee. Stressing the need for the mapping of a general, all-inclusive strategy for the defense activities of American Jewry, Dr. John Slawson, executive vice-president of the Committee, declared that the creation of the department to be headed by Dr. Horkheimer was one of the most important single steps in the evolution of a thoroughly successful civic protective program. He asserted that "the American Jewish community in the grave situation it faces deserves no less than that the best minds in America be assigned to the work of preserving the democratic way in America which is threatened by the cancer of anti-Semitism that so thoroughly destroyed the last vestiges of decency in Germany."

The three major objectives of the new project will be: (a) Investigation of the extent and special nature of anti-Semitism in America; (b) Experimentation with tests for evaluating the effectiveness of current techniques for combating anti-Semitism; and (c) Study of the measures that are today applied to combat anti-Semitism with a view towards enhancing their effectiveness.

The American Jewish Committee lost one of its best men through the sudden death of Dr. Adolph S. Oko, editor of the *Contemporary Jewish Record*, at the age of 61. Dr. Oko, a native of Russia, was a noted Spinoza-scholar, a trustee of the Domus Spinozana (Spinoza's home)

at The Hague, and a founder and American secretary of the Societas Spinozana. For 25 years he was librarian of the Hebrew Union College Library, said to be the largest Jewish library in this country. He purchased a 16th century Talmud, known as the "Goyish Talmud," from a British peer, for the library, and he found records of Jews in China, as a result of which efforts were made to get in touch with these groups in inland China.

△ △ △

THE NIVEAU GALLERY opened an exhibition of paintings by Chaim Soutine, to commemorate that great though peculiar artist who was killed by the Nazis in Paris where he, the son of a Russian Shtaetel, lived for many years, befriended by Amadeo Nodigliani. The artist was cleverly described by a critic as follows:

He is the type of Semite who will look at a beautiful woman and visualize her at once as an old hag or hideous corpse. Or see a rolling meadow writhe in agony as if it possessed human consciousness and were accursed. . . . It would appear from Soutine's paintings that he has chosen the verses of Job as his inspiration, though of course his expression is as natural, as much of himself, as Job's words were of Job. He is as much the Hebrew prophet.

△ △ △

ANOTHER EXHIBITION of great interest is the show of art work by Russian children at the Museum of Modern Art. Included are a number of battle scenes painted by a nine-year-old Jewish boy, Yulik Labas, who lived in Moscow until he was evacuated during the Nazi siege of the city. He listened first to the war communiques, then painted his conception of the battles described.

On the fifth anniversary of the Nazi occupation of Danzig, Scribner's Book Store on Fifth Avenue displayed in its large window religious articles, including several beautiful old Menorahs that originally were owned by the synagogue at

Danzig, but were sent to the Jewish Theological Seminary of America a few weeks before the Nazi invasion.

△ △ △

IN SEPTEMBER, 1844, five New York Jews called upon other Jews with liberal religious principles to start a new congregation. The formal celebration of the centenary of the Congregation Emanu-El was launched at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel on November 14, with a congregational dinner. The principal speaker was Capt. Lewis L. Strauss, USNR, president of the congregation. *The New York Times Magazine* commemorated the event with an article and photos, showing the beautiful temple of early Romanesque design at Fifth Avenue and 65th Street. It might be worth while to recall the first appeal, made by the fathers of Emanu-El at a time when John Tyler was U. S. president:

Convinced of the eternal truths of the religion of Israel, admonished by sentiments of sacred duty, encouraged by the successful example of their enlightened brethren in faith, the undersigned have concluded to form a Jewish religious society, the object of which shall be to introduce an improved worship, in accordance with our times, thereby to elevate the religious and moral culture of their co-religionists.

△ △ △

ANOTHER MEMORABLE ANNIVERSARY was celebrated through an authors' luncheon at the Hotel Commodore: the thirtieth anniversary of the *Menorah Journal*. Speakers from various lands hailed Mr. Henry Hurwitz, the founder and editor-in-chief of one of the most important publications in English devoted to Jewish learning and culture. Among the many Jewish writers originally sponsored by Hurwitz are Marvin Lowenthal and Professor Harry A. Wolfson, now contributing editors.

△ △ △

THE L. BUS-FEKETE-Mary Helen Fay adaptation of Werfel's novel *The Embezzled Heaven* for the Broadway stage dis-

appointed the public, despite the appearance of such artists as Ethel Barrymore and Albert Bassermann. Closely related to *The Song of Bernadette*, it tells the moving story of a simple soul, a Catholic woman cook who, after many tribulations, learns from the Pope himself that heaven cannot be bought, that it must be won through love and faith. The drama failed, because Teta Linek, the cook, is not well drawn so that not even Miss Barrymore can make her real. A good novel was turned into a poor drama!

Much praise should be given to Jacob Ben-Ami's brilliant presentation of H. Leivik's Yiddish drama, *The Miracle of the Warsaw Ghetto*, in the New Jewish People's Theater. It is the story of a young man of Israel who begins as an opponent of the uprising and who ends as its leader. But it is also the drama of the embittered masses, of a tortured people ready to make the final sacrifice. They fight and die under the slogan: "In the name of God, do not despair!"

△ △ △

LET ME FINISH this review with a letter read by several commentators over New York radio stations. It is the letter of a father whose son is a boy scout. When the kid boasted to his Dad, that "there was a Jew in our tent, but he went out fast," the father rebuked him as follows:

... That little Jewish boy is a boy-scout. He is also an American trying to be a better American. You and he raise your hands together every day to salute the same flag—the flag you're so proud of. The Jewish boy is proud of that flag, too ... I wonder where he went after you chased him out? Did he go to another tent with tears in his eyes and say: 'Please may I sleep in your tent, because Bucky and his pals won't let me stay in theirs? ... Think about it, Bucky. That's how the Nazis treat Jewish people. And, Bucky, that's one of the reasons why your Uncle John and all your folks are in this war—because Hitler began to chase people. ... And I'll bet that Jewish boy has uncles and cousins, and maybe a daddy, fighting alongside our family. ... They're all fighting because they are Americans, son. ... Not because they are Gentile or Jew. ...

BOOKS

The Idea of Nationalism: A Study in Its Origins and Background, by Hans Kohn. New York, Macmillan. 735 pp. \$7.50.

"Nationalism is an idea," observes Professor Hans Kohn, "an *idée force*, which fills man's brain and heart with new thoughts and new sentiments, and drives him to translate his consciousness into deeds of organized action." This is the theme of Kohn's brilliant, exhaustive, and well-written analysis of the most overwhelming phenomenon of our times. Today, when German National Socialism has raised nationalism to the level of a mystical absolute quality, ruthlessly crushing or subordinating all other values, it is timely indeed to examine the various strands of thought which make up nationalism.

Unlike certain students of nationalism, Dr. Kohn insists at the outset: "Nationalism, as we understand it, is not older than the second half of the eighteenth century. Its first great manifestation was the French Revolution, which gave the new movement an increased dynamic force." Nevertheless, the author finds that the roots of modern nationalism appear in the very origins of the Western Tradition, in the civilizations of ancient Judea and Greece. In fact this volume deals primarily with the evolution of the spirit of nationality up to the end of the eighteenth century. He refutes much that has been commonly regarded as an early manifestation of nationalism, e.g., the organization of medieval university students by "nations," or the seating of the clergy at the Council of Constance according to nationality. A major theme is the cultural rivalry of such cosmopolitan traditions as the Catholic Church and the medieval Roman Empire for world supremacy; subsequently he stresses the competition of the early nation-states against the persistent Roman imperial dream of world rule. He implies (as the former ambassador

of Loyalist Spain, Fernando de los Rios, has also recently done) that Spanish nationalism in the days Ferdinand, Isabella, and the Inquisition had a startling resemblance to the racialist theories of Hitler's Germany. On the whole, however, the author tends to discount, rather than to multiply, the known instances of nationalism in medieval and early modern times.

Readers of the CHICAGO JEWISH FORUM will be particularly interested in Professor Kohn's analysis of the incipient nationalism existing in ancient Judea. The people of tribal Israel, like the ancient Greeks, combined a sense of racial and cultural solidarity with a democratic feeling of equality and common destiny. Jews, particularly, stressed the social legislation of the Bible and respect for the dignity of the individual—factors which tended to transform mere tribal nationalism into something infinitely higher. In a brilliant passage, filled with genuine poetic feeling, Kohn contrasts Jewish and Hellenic culture: "To the artistic serenity of the Greek the Jew opposed a burning religiosity; but the difference went deeper. While the Greek developed the plastic sense to perfection, the Jew did not see so much as he heard; he lived in time—Thus God personified himself to the Jews, not in the image, but in the call. In Jewish prayers and in Jewish literature the "Hear!" sounds again and again." The Greeks, who could create the complex harmony of dramatic music, lacked the solitary lyrical song of the psalms with their infinite aspirations in time. The Jews, for all their tribalism (the Greeks had their own variety of this), moved toward the unification of humanity and reiterated the oneness of God as the source of that unity.

Jewish consciousness was perpetuated by a strong historical sense, particularly in the interpretation of Biblical history as the unfolding of God's purpose for Israel. Specifically, as the author declares,

Jewish nationalism grew out of three elements: the idea of the chosen people, the consciousness of national history, and national Messianism. However, this type of nationalism was modified by a strong sense of ethics and universal values. In fact, one traditional Jewish story had it that God did not single out the Jews as the people of the Covenant, but that all other nations rejected it and Israel alone chose to accept and abide by this ideal of a just community. The prophets used their powerful moral fervor to deepen the popular consciousness of Israel's universal mission to found a kingdom of righteousness on earth. Thus Jewish nationalism emancipated itself from the early form of tribal exclusiveness to aspire after a common ethical goal for all mankind.

A different type of nationalist aspiration after universality appears in the history of German nationalism. Although the German state was late in emerging and its feeling of nationality was hampered by the survival of the notion that Central Europe was the heir of the world-embracing Roman Empire, certain suggestions of the future *Herrenvolk* appeared early in German history. Not a few German humanists of Luther's day, delving into history, were confident that none were more worthy to rule the world than the German race. Some insisted that Adam himself spoke German! However, Kohn's evidence indicates that the influential Prussian militarism of Frederick the Great was not based on the notion of German or even Prussian nationalism—important as this militarist tradition was for the later Nazis. As for the great men of early modern German literature, these failed to cast a decisive influence on the emerging German state. "The Gelehrtenrepublik," says Kohn, "lived in an entirely unpolitical realm, at the fringes of society and without any influence." Schiller and Goethe, admirers of the cosmopolitan tradition, were indifferent to German nationalism. Germans would have done well to heed Schiller's advice,

"Vainly you hope, O Germans, to form yourselves a nation;

Form yourselves free men, as well as you can, instead."

Altogether, the book is packed with ideas which cannot be summarily disposed of in a review—unlike so many

current volumes, whose intellectual stock-in-trade can be summarized in a brief paragraph. This is the mature product of several decades of extensive research, writing, and travel and offers a trustworthy guide to the most perplexing problem of our age—rampant nationalism. Professor Kohn, who is already noted for other books on nationalism, must now be recognized as the foremost authority on the subject, eclipsing in breadth and understanding the pioneer studies in nationalism by Carlton J. H. Hayes and the Columbia group of scholars associated with him.

HARVEY WISH

Diagnosis of Our Time, by Karl Mannheim. Oxford University Press. 195 pp. \$3.00.

Karl Mannheim, the eminent European sociologist, has deeply influenced American sociological thought, particularly with his book "Ideology and Utopia—An Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge." Thus it is no wonder that a new book by an author of such renown creates more than a routine interest. Anticipation is especially sharpened by the title—"Diagnosis of Our Time." But the book does not fulfil the promise of that title.

It is a collection of lectures and papers which appeared between 1939 and 1941 and are centered around "topical problems of our social and political life." While they obviously spring from an interested attempt to diagnose our time, their mere inclusion between two covers does not produce the systematic approach and comprehensive scope required for such a task. "*Prolegomena* to a Diagnosis of Our Time," would have been a more appropriate title.

Mannheim's aim is to utilize some of the accumulated insights of modern sociology to understand the Anglo-Saxon pattern of Democracy and to explore its actual deficiencies and new potentialities. To him the crisis of our time is fundamentally a crisis in valuation. Liberalism abused the freedoms of *laissez-faire*, allowed a chaos of competing and unreconciled valuations in all realms of social and political activities, and thus left our democratic regime without a focus. Liberalism, it is true, had longed for an equilibrium of its contrasting values but

failed to achieve it because liberals did nothing but hope, vaguely and vainly, that a sort of automatic self-adjustment would take care of everything.

Of course, says Mannheim, to institute a regimented culture and authoritarian education in a totalitarian spirit would be expelling a bad devil with a dreadful Beelzebub. Mannheim suggests a third course to lead society out of the crisis: *Planning for Freedom*. Such planning (as opposed to the out-dated *laissez-faire*) would free the genuine and spontaneous social controls from the disintegrating efforts of modern mass society. It would lead to the invention of new techniques which perform the function of democratic self-regulation on a higher plane of awareness and purposeful organization. It would finally result in a Planned Liberalism, avoiding the Scylla of uncontrolled *laissez-faire* and the Charybdis of dictatorial regimentation.

In this light Mannheim discusses the problems of youth in modern society, education and social awareness, Nazi group strategy, and, in the longest essay of the book, the role of Christianity in evolving a new social philosophy. The latter discussion is doubtless the most stimulating, not for the solution offered, but for revealing the unsolved difficulties of Mannheim's schemes and the shortcomings of his naive trust in mere sociological methods.

Classical liberalism could do without religion. In fact, it grew in many respects by attacking the claims of religion. Planned freedom and planned democratic society, Mannheim asserts, should be assisted by religion—one of the deepest sources of human regeneration—for the sake of spiritual integration. The function of religion would be to recommend concrete patterns of behavior, or, to summarize another passage, to strengthen such basic virtues as decency, mutual help, honesty, and social justice, and to fortify responsibility.

But will religion be satisfied with this role?

Such assistance is nothing new. For a long time it has been solicited by liberal society, especially in America, and has readily been granted. Religious thinkers have pointed out that by serving as a reservoir of ideas and attitudes to liberalism, religion and its value lost identity in a process of gradual but final secular-

ization. Mannheim looks at religion's contribution to society from the standpoint of a sociologist. But religion has recently found forceful spokesmen among liberals who insist on an evaluation of society and politics from a *genuinely* religious view point and claim that the permanent process of such evaluation constitutes the "legitimate" contribution of religion. A diagnosis of liberal trends in our time should take cognizance of this.

FRITZ BAMBERGER

The Jew In Our Day, by Waldo Frank. Duell, Sloan & Pearce, Inc. \$2.50.

Jacob Wasserman, one of the best known proponents of Jewish rights, once said, "We must be a very famous people, the whole world is talking about us." This has especially been true since Hitler has expressed his determination to banish democracy and the Jews from the face of the earth.

Among the many defenders of Israel, Mr. Waldo Frank, is one of the most outstanding. He has lectured on the subject from the rostrums of church and synagogue, and written articles, in magazines that intelligent men and women are presumed to read, against Nazism and in favor of its victims, with special reference to the persecuted and oppressed Jews in Germany and other lands; a selected number of those lectures and articles compose the volume presented to the reading public under the title, *The Jew In Our Day*.

As a rhetorical or literary effort the lectures and magazine items so collected deserve more praise than this writer is disposed to bestow; but as an attempt to portray the Jew in our day, the analysis of his problem or the presentation of a solution thereof, the job is a lamentable failure.

The author poses the proposition that "the Jews are different" and at once goes on to add that "philosemites are wrong when they say that the Jew is superior in intelligence, morality, or civic virtue. . . . Man for man, woman for woman I find the Jews are far from being the best or brightest people in the world as some noble Christians are pleased to call them." Considering the Jews in our day en masse, the author says that like the non-Jews "they are a fumbling, weak-minded, will-less lot." It might be noted here that

of the few who have achieved some greatness there is again no difference between Jews and non-Jews. There is no difference, for instance, between Litvinov and Molotov; Justice Frankfurter and Justice Roberts; Waldo Frank and Albert J. Nock; or between Sumner Welles and Henry Morgenthau, Jr.

Nowhere within the 37 pages devoted to a discussion of the difference of the Jew does the author point to any specific characteristic typical of all Jews in our day which distinguishes them from the Gentiles. All he says on that point is: "The Jews are different because they issue from a great and potent tradition which for more than three thousand years has kept its continuous identity and its one general direction." In vain does the reader plow through the rest of 200 pages to find the sense in which the author uses this much abused word "tradition."

If he means the conversation between God and Abraham; the Deluge which the God of Israel is alleged to have imposed upon everything that had the breath of life in it; or the exodus of the children of Israel from Egypt, or the commandments, the Statutes, and the ordinances contained in the Bible, the Jews in our day I believe, for the most part think of these as poetic myths. What is this great and potent tradition with which the Magna Charta; or the Declaration of Independence can not be compared? Is the battle of the Maccabees against Epiphanes, greater and more potent than the battles of Lexington and Concord?

With the delineation of the tenuous differentia in the Jews as derived from some sort of a potent tradition the author proceeds "toward an analysis of the problem," and arrives at the conclusion that "in essence the problem of the Jews is the problem of the spirit." Mr. Frank may not know it, but his Grandfather's problem as a Jew was not of the spirit; it involved the opportunity to live a Jewish life, in conformity with the commandments the statutes and the ordinances enumerated in the bible, in a non-Jewish world. No matter what the spiritual attitude of Isaiah or Jesus was, our fathers were concerned entirely with the letter, not the spirit of the law. In our day the letter has been abandoned and neither Jew nor Christian troubles himself about the spirit.

And finally Mr. Frank proposes a solution which involves the return of the Jew to their tradition even if that should involve great suffering. "We have our Jewish problem," says Mr. Frank. "It regards . . . essentially no such matters as prejudice, charity, or the farms of Zion. . . . It is the problem of the idea. . . . The Jewish community had best give up worrying so pleasantly so self soothingly, about Prejudices, Pogroms, Poverty, and Palestine. . . . If he is not willing to suffer, willing to be poor, willing to be alone, as once he suffered and was poor and alone he is not even a candidate for that self knowledge whereby only he may bring value once again to the word Jew."

If the persecuted Jew of Germany, Poland, Hungary, and the other anti-Jewish countries were told of this kind of solution of the Jewish problem he would probably say as did the wounded Jewish soldier when a priest sought to explain to him the intricacies connected with the idea of the Father the Son and the Holy Ghost, "I am dying and he is telling me riddles."

BERNARD J. BROWN

Faith, Reason and Civilization: An Essay in Historical Analysis, by Harold J. Laski. New York: The Viking Press. 187 pages. \$2.50.

Mr. Laski has written another Marxist tract for the times. The wicked believers in free enterprise are called upon to repent and the faithful are called upon for renewed effort. In the course of the development of his main thesis, however, the reader will find penetrating discussions of such matters as the transvaluation of values in contemporary society; contemporary literature, in which he attacks the troglodytic tendencies of Eliot, Joyce, and Aldous Huxley; the irresponsibility and detachment of the academics in the social sciences; and historiography, in which he traces an analogy between the rise of Christianity in the ancient world and the rise of the soviets after the decline of the western world in 1917.

Throughout this essay we find two basic unresolved conflicts in Mr. Laski's thinking. He does not seem to have as yet decided whether materialistic or spiritual values are supreme. On the one hand, we find a championing of economic value as the summum bonum, but there

are also indications that a spiritual faith which needs no extrinsic justification may also be the end we should seek. The second conflict concerns the causative factors in social phenomena, a conflict which characterizes his use of the Marxist method. He moves rather casually from economic determinism to an emphasis on the importance of intellectual concepts in shaping man's destiny. The use of the word "Reason" in the book's title is hardly justified in view of his emphasis on the importance of economic factors in shaping history, for Marxist method is basically romanticist or even "irrationalistic."

The thesis of the book may be briefly summarized: the war has stirred a faith in men's souls and this faith must be kept alive after the war. Faith has been stirred because of the vision of a brave new world patterned after the soviet system, but unless we actualize this type of society in the post war world, victory will turn to ashes in our mouths. Without faith life is meaningless; with faith it is purposeful and significant. The vision of Utopia centers in Russia, where for the first time in history men have found the right path to economic well-being and the highest spiritual values, such as fraternity. If we retain the acquisitive society and its capitalistic free enterprise after the war, this will constitute a betrayal of our men in arms.

This thesis is supported by many cogent arguments, but also by a considerable amount of special pleading and selected facts. Though we love Utopias we should love the truth, i.e., the whole truth, even more, and so Mr. Laski's omissions and biases deserve some attention.

To begin with, we find the overall general assumption that our institutions are evil and that Russia's are good. In our society an impassable gulf separates the rulers from the ruled, great wealth on the one hand and the slavery of poverty on the other. He condemns our acquisitive system based upon the "cash-nexus," in Carlyle's language. But he pays little attention to Russia's poor, or to the stratification into rulers and ruled in Russia's political life, or to the growing extremes in economic well-being emerging in that country. Wendell Willkie told a revealing story about a young factory superintendent who earned ten times as much as the average skilled workman in his plant

and who owned not only a town home but a cottage in the country as well, for hunting and fishing on week-ends. And certainly a civilization which professes allegiance to a materialistic philosophy will have its overtones of acquisitiveness too.

Proof that Russian society is best, he tells us, is found in the Red Army's heroism at Stalingrad and in Russia's gigantic war production. For how else, he asks, can we explain these miracles? But if this argument is not a non sequitur, then American heroism at Tarawa justifies the New Deal and the Nazi system is justified by German heroism at Cassino. Or the English under the blitz, or the Poles at Warsaw. Mr. Laski forgets, too, that the Russians were aided by Hitler's intuition. He thinks that great heroism is impossible unless there is allegiance to noble ideals for which we fight, but this is certainly naive in view of the manner in which Japanese soldiers fight.

The Russian productive miracle is explained by the fact that in Russia technological efficiency is untrammelled by the profit motive. But, if by their fruits ye shall know them, then, reasoning as Mr. Laski does, the even greater productive miracle in the United States must be explained by the profit motive.

He glosses the cruelty and suffering in pre-war Russia by telling us that cruelty was inevitable under the circumstances (parenthetically that we have no right to throw stones) and justified by the values achieved. But he never mentions the possibility that values may have been lost; spiritual values, for example, such as the spirit of disinterested inquiry. Nor does he ever suggest that there may be values in our way of life which should be cherished, such as freedom. Mr. Laski's attitude toward freedom reminds us of Nietzsche's hostility toward "freedom from" in favor of "freedom for;" he proceeds to define freedom as something akin to economic security.

I emphasize these matters without intending in any way to belittle the productive miracles in Russia, or the glorious heroism of its armies and partisans, but in protest against a kind of spiritual masochism which afflicts many American and British liberals, who, like Mr. Laski, have serious blind spots with respect to the magnificent achievements of their own nations.

Another element in his thinking is so characteristic of a segment of liberal thought that it requires extended comment. I refer to his profound misconception of the *raison d'être* of World War II. Mr. Laski constantly loses sight of two primary reasons why we fight: (1) we fight to preserve our freedom as a sovereign power so that we may determine by our collective will what our future shall be, and (2) we were predisposed to fight the Axis, aside from strategic considerations, because the Nazi-Fascist monsters so shocked the conscience of the world as to make us ashamed that we were not engaged in the task of exterminating them. It is true that we would have fought a civilized nation which attacked us and we would not have fought if we were not attacked, but if ever the intelligent leadership of a nation wholeheartedly approved of participation in a war, it was this war. To Mr. Laski, however, the primary justification for this war is the possibility that out of its horror and suffering will come a Socialist Utopia. But is it not a betrayal of the moral conscience of mankind to say that we require the post-war establishment of socialist institutions in Britain and America to justify our fighting? This war needs no seal of approval from Mr. Laski.

The author, in fact, seems to believe that the western powers were responsible for World War II because of their failure to establish an equalitarian society after the close of the last war. ("The real outcome of the first World War was the second World War; for in the intervening years there was no statesman in power, outside of Russia, to whom a frontal attack on vested interests appeared permissible," p. 69). In our blindness, he charges, we failed to see that free enterprise cannot satisfy the legitimate aspirations of the masses, and our insistence on a free enterprise society was one of the causes that led to the ghastly conflict. This leads to the inference that unless we establish a social order patterned after Russia's, our boys will have died in vain. "Only as our achievement for those who come after us seeks some genuine proportion to the sacrifice we exact from them, shall we receive acquittal at the bar of history" (p. 187).

His basic error is the failure to see that we are fighting *against* a counter revolution, and not *for* a revolution. He admits, on page 175, that "it is, no doubt,

wholly true that the defeat of the Axis powers is the essential prelude to the general transformation of the acquisitive society into socialist democracy," but it is prelude only. His primary enemy seems to be, not the Axis, but capitalism. Mr. Laski's position is perilously close to that of the liberal-isolationists before June 22, 1941. These thinkers told us that the war was an imperialist war in which moral values were irrelevant. The war, they said, had economic roots, and was in fact merely a jockeying for economic power. Mr. Laski seems to agree insofar as he thinks that we will add a moral dimension to this war only by the establishment of a certain type of society as its aftermath. Another aspect of his moral indifference is revealed by his dismissal of Hitler and other individuals as unimportant cogs in the economic wheel of destiny, for ethical judgments can be exercised only by fastening moral blame on individual human beings.

Mr. Laski also assumes too easily that his particular dogmas are eternal truths, and that to disagree with him is to betray our men in arms. But men of good will differ not only with respect to simple questions such as whether to give Germany a hard or a soft peace, but also with respect to difficult questions such as whether a planned or a free enterprise economy will result in a higher standard of economic well-being. Hayek, among others, would argue that a free system, with its more rational allocation of resources, will result in a higher standard of living for the masses.

In his last chapter Mr. Laski issues a call for action immediately upon the cessation of hostilities. ("The prelude to peace is a war," 184); "our task only begins when our enemies lay down their arms," 186). Since the revolution can come only by consent or force, and consent is unlikely, this must mean civil war. So that we may receive an acquittal at the bar of history?

LIONEL RUBY

American Political Parties: Their Natural History, by Wilfred E. Binkley. Alfred A. Knopf, 1943. xix 407 pp. \$3.75.

In this brilliant study of the climate of public opinion at the critical periods in our political history, Dr. Binkley starts with the assumption that the chief obligation of the President of the United

States is to provide political leadership for the country. Consequently, he damns with equally faint praise both Grover Cleveland and Herbert Hoover because they both were inept when it came to harmonizing the conflicting interests of this vast country. Dr. Binkley makes it clear that the dominant interests to be harmonized at any given moment were economic. But he makes it equally clear that the influences which determined voting in any given year were frequently long established prejudices which were not basically economic, such as hatred of the British, antagonism of the native American stock toward the immigrants, slavery as a moral issue, prohibition as a moral issue, etc.

Because of his belief that the paramount duty of a president is to harmonize conflicting interests, he presents favorably Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, McKinley, Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin D. Roosevelt.

This realistic study of American political history will be especially salutary reading for the intelligentsia of the United States because it rectifies some prevailing opinions distorted by partisan propaganda. For instance, the average elderly intellectual in the United States has the impression that Theodore Roosevelt was always a social minded person in striking contrast to William McKinley and Mark Hanna. But Dr. Binkley points out that

Theodore Roosevelt himself was indeed experiencing a remarkable personal conversion. Curiously enough, his social philosophy in more than one respect had long lagged behind that of Hanna and McKinley. Even a decade after the Hanna of the seventies had inaugurated the earliest labor-union contracts and McKinley had defended the Massillon strikers, the legislator Theodore Roosevelt was branding the twelve-hour limit for street-car motormen as socialistic, un-American, and due to the spread of communistic ideas. Meanwhile he was voting to retain the vicious New York contract prison-labor system and opposing pensions for teachers. Hanna was blistering Pullman in 1894 for not arbitrating, while Roosevelt was commending Cleveland for sending troops to suppress the strikers. When Roosevelt explained his anti-labor votes with the dogma that the law of supply and demand could no more be repealed than the law of gravitation, he was only applying the economic lessons he had learned in the Harvard classes of Professor J. L. Laughlin, who had taken the inhuman economics of John Stuart Mill and made them still more inhuman. (pp. 336-7)

Dr. Binkley says that in spite of this bad start of Roosevelt the First,

Judged by the wide range of the elements in his following, Theodore Roosevelt stands pre-eminent among American artists in group diplomacy. No other political leader has ever managed to marshal beneath his banner such a complete cross-section of American society. Here was a wizard who could "organize the unorganizable," and who, at least momentarily, integrated such incongruous and hostile elements as employers, employees, farmers, and the professions into an all-class combination captivated by the emotion-charged slogan of the Square Deal. Equally at home among boisterous cowboys or ward politicians or in the parlors of the intelligentsia, he fascinated them all with his infectious and convincing friendship. (p. 338)

Of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Binkley says, It is doubtful whether a more spectacular feat of political leadership can be found in American history than that by which the newly inaugurated President rallied a despairing people in the midst of what looked to many like the disintegration of organized society. . . . Roosevelt's flair for the dramatic, his appeal to the feelings rather than the intellect, his long experience with party organizations and as a legislator, administrator, and executive, all equipped him for exploiting the unparalleled opportunity thrust at him by the crisis of 1933. (p. 378)

In marshaling these historical data to picture the "natural history of political parties in the United States" Dr. Binkley has been brief, concise, and to the point, never pausing for a single moment to narrate some interesting story or bit of gossip that does not contribute definitely to the main thesis. It is this strict attention to his thesis that enables him to narrate and evaluate this hundred and sixty years of history in such an interesting and sparkling manner with less than one hundred and sixteen thousand words. It is "must" reading for those Americans who desire to understand the American political scene today.

O. GARFIELD JONES

Spain, by Salvador de Madariaga. Creative Age Press. 509 pp. \$4.00.

Spain is in the limelight again. Thousands of Republican exiles who gallantly helped the French Forces of the Interior cleanse France of the German invaders, used their weapons for an attack on the hated Franco regime. They swept over the border into their homeland, won several skirmishes with the dictator's armies and caused severe head-ache in Madrid, until France assured the Spanish Fascists that she would take care of these unruly elements herself. The formal recognition of De Gaulle's government was the price paid to France by Hitler's disciples on

the Iberian peninsula, and Spain's most progressive and democratic elements were betrayed again: "Their suppression is regarded here as a problem for the local French authorities," Reuter cynically reported from the Spanish capital.

Under these circumstances it might be helpful to peruse Madariaga's informative book, a predominantly political study which could have borne, as a motto, old Macaulay's famous statement, made more than a hundred years ago, but still valid: "All the causes of the decay of Spain resolve themselves into one cause: bad government." Madariaga, Oxford professor of Spanish Studies and one-time delegate to the League of Nations, has endeavored to give an unbiased history of his country from the fall of Islam-held Granada to fanatical Christianity in 1492, to the fall of Loyalist Madrid to that savior of Christendom from Bolshevism, General Franco, in 1939. The author candidly discusses the land and the people of Spain, the Spanish Empire, and particularly that "modern" Spain that developed after the backward and isolated kingdom lost its last important colonial possessions in the war with the United States.

After perusing Madariaga's volume one might describe Spain's history in the twentieth century as a battle between the "Generation of 1898"—symbolized by such progressive writers as Miguel de Unamuno, Jose Ortega y Gasset, and the liberal Madariaga himself—and the medieval forces of reaction. The latter were defeated in 1931 when "La Niña Bonita," the democratic republic, was born. The "Pretty Girl" had hardly time to re-orientate herself and to prepare for Spain's entry into the main stream of modern western civilization, when she was raped and finally killed by Franco's henchmen and his German and Italian allies.

Madariaga, who calls himself a "middle-of-the-road diehard," attributes the republic's tragedy mostly to the internecine struggles between the various factions in the Loyalist camp, especially to the doctrinaireism and uncompromising spirit of the radical wing. Feeling that he may have stressed the errors and shortcomings of the Left more severely than the atrocities committed by the Right, he excuses himself by saying that "It is from the Left rather than from the Right that we expect our future; it is the Left,

therefore, which stands in need of criticism." But because of his predilection for the center Madariaga did not criticize Premier Azana who precipitated the republic's fall by failing to imprison the treacherous generals. In a note, published in the book's American edition only, he admits frankly, that, in the text, he underestimated the help given to the rebels by the Fascists and Nazis.

Franco's government of bigots and murderers must not be allowed to survive the destruction of Hitlerism. We should like to apply Madariaga's hopeful words: "There is no question that the vitality of the Spanish people is now rising," written for the book's first edition on the eve of the republican revolution, to the intrepid Spanish exiles who are waiting in France, North Africa, Mexico, and elsewhere to be called to give the death-blow to the tottering Franco regime. But we do not agree with the sentence that follows: "Precisely, because her gifts are not the kind which make for collective and political success in an age like ours, the fact may be obscured that Spain . . . counts and always will count, far more as a people than as a nation, and as a nation than as a state." Such defeatist utterances are grist to the mills of the Rightists, who claim the monopoly of realistic rulership. One should be able to imagine a renewed Spain, developing, like the Russia of 1917, from the most backward to the most progressive state in Europe.

Madariaga who, in an earlier volume, sought to prove that Columbus was of Jewish origin, is a true friend of the Jewish people. In the present volume he praises the loyalty of the Sephardic Jews who retained the Spanish language in their exile, and asserts that, notwithstanding reactionary machinations, anti-Semitic prejudice is "nearly non-existent" in contemporary Spain.

ALFRED WERNER

Turkey: Key to the East, by Chester M. Tobin. G. P. Putnam's Sons. New York. 170 pp. \$2.00.

Mr. Tobin in the introduction to this book makes no secret of the fact that he is a great admirer of modern Turkey. Since his return from Turkey in 1927 he has, in his own words, "endeavored to portray to Americans the real Turks and

their vibrant progressive nation." Consequently, his book, while quite informative, lacks in places the objectivity of a detached reporter. At times the reader cannot escape the impression that the author simply whitewashes some ugly spots in Turkey's history.

Kemal Pasha the creator and the great reformer of new Turkey deserved all the credit and glory that Mr. Tobin bestows upon him but there was no need to minimize the almost totalitarian regime that he established. Although he rescued Turkey from the decay and corruption of the Ottoman Empire, he had given little democracy to the Turks. The Turkish Parliament has only one party, but for a few opposition representatives . . . appointed by the government. It is quite true, as the author points out, that the process of democratization has started but it seems to be somewhat slow. It does not follow that the great achievements of Kemal Pasha in giving Turkey a government free from theological interference, in improving the Civil Service and in giving suffrage to women—should move the reader to exonerate the great Turkish leader for his brutal ruthlessness that he has displayed toward the Kurds.

No one can deny that the position of Turkey pressed by Germany on one side and the Allies on the other was most delicate and difficult. But it is debatable if Mr. Tobin is right in stating that the Turkish foreign policy in the recent war years was the only one it could follow. "In July 1940", says Mr. Tobin, "the Turks were driven to sign a new commercial agreement with Germany for twenty million Turkish pounds to avoid economic collapse". No objective reporters have reported that in 1940, Turkey was on the verge of economic collapse. They did, however, report that the new trade agreement with Turkey will greatly benefit Turkish economy and harm considerably the Allied war effort. Laval has also defended his collaboration with the Nazis by his desire to save France from an economic debacle. Fortunately Turkey did not go too far in its relations with Germany and when the Allied position improved the Turks cut the export of chrome to Germany.

In spite of the author's somewhat biased apologies for some Turkish policies, the book is a worthwhile source of information on a nation not too well known in America.

MARK KRUG

The Four Fears, by Elbert D. Thomas. Ziff-Davis Publishing Co., 189 pp. \$2.00.

The Four Fears which endanger American cooperation for world peace are: The Fear of Entangling Alliances, The Fear of England and Russia, The Fear of Idealism, and The Fear of Revolution. These fears are born of ignorance and the weakening of the democratic faith due to our self-sufficiency and prosperity. Yet unless we dismiss these fears for the bogeys that they are, the hope of our effective participation in a league of nations to prevent war and to promote international prosperity is slim. Senator Thomas is convincing on that score.

The warning voiced by Washington and Jefferson to avoid foreign alliances whenever possible did not, as history shows, dissuade from such alliances when they were necessary to our security. We were glad, on occasion, to welcome France as an ally. England, too, though not in formal alliance with us until World War I, was on many occasions our tacit ally. The English fleet stood between us and foreign aggression. The English have been often more helpful to us than we deserved and we have requited them shabbily.

The fear of Russia has no historical justification. Until the Russian Revolution, indeed, our relations with Russia were of the best—possibly because Russia was so remote and Russian and American interests did not clash. It was the fear of Communism that led to our hysterical intervention and our later refusal for so long to recognize the Soviet regime. The fear of Russia is still strong among our conservative and propertied classes and springs from their fear of revolution. The Sons and Daughters of the American Revolution, having become wealthy and conservative since the days in which their ancestors risked life and fortune for the democratic cause, no longer believe with Jefferson in the right or desirability of revolution. They fear change, especially economic change which might deprive their kind, as in Russia, of property and power.

Democracy in the modern world is more than political. It is economic also. America, while paying lip service to democracy, has been slow to reinterpret the term in such a way as to keep its meaning bright and fresh. Times and conditions change. Isolationism is no longer possible, if for no other reason than that

oceans can no longer protect us. And in a world of monopolies and cartels and mass production the democratic right to cast a ballot does not mean a great deal unless accompanied by the right to economic security and the freedom from industrial serfdom. These recognitions are slowly—far too slowly—seeping into the consciousness of the common man.

Senator Thomas, knowing his history and knowing the world both from study and foreign travel, has written a powerful and persuasive book. Were one hundred thousand of our economic royalists diligently to study it for a few days it might effect that peaceful revolution which is needed to bring us up to date with the advanced social and political thought of our time. Nor would these conservative folk suffer in their pocket-books by learning as a nation to cooperate with other nations nor, as a class within the nation, to welcome cooperation with the government. Clearly the world becomes of necessity more of an economic unit year by year. Clearly, too, in the economic development of the United States the government and industry must work increasingly together for the benefit of the citizens as a whole. There will never be peace and happiness within the United States until economic justice is done to all. Nor will there be enduring peace throughout the world until every peon is well shod and fed and every Hottentot baby has its bottle of milk—pasteurized, vitaminized, and irradiated at that.

Senator Thomas' book invites quotation but I must content myself with brief excerpts. Of freedom from want he writes:

The first step in winning freedom from want lies in learning one prime fact: *Freedom from want is not a war veteran's bonus.* It is not something a kindly Congress is going to present to the boys when they come home. It is not something that may be used as a slogan to play off one group of men against another. We shall not let it be used as a means of replacing labor in the factories with "grateful" returning soldiers. Freedom from want is something all our people must have, and not just our people, but people everywhere. For if no nation can survive half slave, half free, the modern world cannot survive half fed, half starving. This is not a party matter, a regional matter, nor a continental matter. It is a universal matter. (P. 111).

That half the world should live half fed is due merely to human selfishness and stupidity, for we have the knowledge to draw from nature all that we need:

In a society capable of unprecedented mass production we still operate in terms of limited

production and therefore of limited consumption. In an era of science that promises undreamed of possibilities in synthetics, we still talk of the meagerness of nature. In a world where half the world has far more than it needs, the other half is starving. (p. 117.)

Senator Thomas quotes from an article in the *New York Times* commemorating the twentieth anniversary of Woodrow Wilson's death. This, I think, is the key sentence: "He was repudiated as an idealist, and we returned to 'normalcy'; but if he could come back to the earth today, who would refuse him the title of the supreme realist of his generation." So in our day Henry Wallace is repudiated as an 'idealist' and I have no doubt that Senator Thomas will be likewise scorned by the hard-headed realists who largely mismanage our world.

Why is it that these 'realists' so called live always in some cuckoo-land of the past, some fabled land of normalcy and rugged individualism where government never interferes in business except to erect protective tariffs, vote subsidies, and otherwise grant favors to the few at the expense of the many? Why in the end are they shown to be so unworldly, so little fitted for practical leadership save in the narrowest affairs? Why, if they learn, do they always tragically learn too little and too late? Perhaps it is because they think only with their heads whereas, as has been said, true thought arises from the heart—and, it may be added, from the imagination. Senator Thomas has both heart—feeling for his kind—and creative imagination, the power to envision a better world for all of us, if we will to have it so and implement the plan with the deed.

CARL GRABO

Medicine and War, Edited by Wm. H. Taliaferro. University of Chicago Press. 188 pp. \$2.00.

This volume is a collection of 10 lectures given by members of the faculty of the Division of the Biological Sciences of the University of Chicago, sponsored by The Walgreen Foundation Studies of American Institutions, and published by the University of Chicago Press.

This 188 page book is packed full of interesting information about such timely and relatively little known subjects as Chemical Warfare, Aviation Medicine, Psychiatry and the War, etc., each lecture having been given by a specialist

in his field. It is of interest to the laity as well as to the profession, and, in spite of the scientifically sounding title, the reading is not only interesting, but, in part, fascinating.

As is to be expected from the size of the volume, the subjects are discussed, more or less, in outline. Those desiring a more thorough study will find a bibliography at the end of each chapter.

The strides that have been made in medicine are so recent that we forget that such products as the sulfa drugs and penicillin were practically unheard of only a decade ago. Compared with the progress in the past 1000 years, the progress in the last generation has been phenomenal. In Luckhardt's lecture on the Historical Background and Introduction one finds that medicine hardly deserved the name science only 100 years ago; not that medicine has reached the stage where it can be called a pure science. Oh, no! But, at the rate we are going that desired state may not be very far off.

Food and the War is discussed by Paul R. Cannon. It is now common knowledge that the Central Powers lost War I because their food supply ran out, and continued malnutrition undermined their morale. It is not unlikely that food may again be a potent factor in breaking the Nazi morale, particularly the shortage of fats.

Although quinine has been used by South American Indians for hundreds of years in the treatment of malaria, chemotherapy can be said to begin in 1907 when Ehrlich discovered 606 for the treatment of syphilis. Since then the discovery of the sulfa drugs by Domagk, and penicillin by Fleming reads like a fairy tale. All these therapeutic agents as well as emetine for amebiasis, tyrothricin and gramicidin are playing a great role in the treatment of our armed forces. They will continue to play a great role after the war. The lecture was given by E. M. K. Geiling.

From Taliaferro we learn a great many interesting sidelights about malaria. While our boys in the Pacific islands are attacked by this dread disease, the native population of those islands seem to be free from it, which would indicate that immunity to this disease can be developed, but this immunity does not apply to all the different species of the

plasmodium. We have no way, as yet, of acquiring the immunity artificially. One is amazed at the tremendous incidence of the disease—one-fifth to one-third of the world's population has it. In India alone 100,000,000 people have malaria with a yearly mortality of 1,000,000.

The chapter on Insects, Disease, and Modern Transportation by Clay C. Huff leaves us concerned about the dangers of bringing in diseases native to Africa and Asia by the air route through the medium of insects, rats, and infected passengers. There is a problem our health officers will have to solve in some manner similar to the inspection of boats in harbors, only that the airplane offers more formidable difficulties. An instance is cited where one plane transported to Brazil, a malignant form of malaria previously native to Africa only. It took a great effort on the part of the Brazilian government, the Rockefeller Institute, and even the boy scouts to eradicate this disease, and only after 3 years' time.

The chapters on Shock and Blood Substitutes by Alexander Brunschwig, on Cerebral Injuries by A. Earl Walker and Ward C. Halstead, and on Psychiatry and the War by David Slight are the ones I referred to previously as making fascinating reading, and yet they are filled with solid information.

Perhaps the most fascinating chapter is the one on Aviation Medicine by Henry T. Ricketts. Flying has become so widespread that it seems hardly believable that this method of transportation is barely two decades old. When one reads about a 2000 plane attack on Berlin, little do we realize how much study had to be done to overcome, what seemed, almost insurmountable obstacles, to make it possible for the fliers to be up 20,000 feet without bursting ear drums and without suffering distention from the intestinal gases. Few of us realize what studies had to be made of pressures at the various levels in the atmosphere. Studies had to be made of the early symptoms of anoxia and its cure, how to overcome the difficulties of a sudden rise, and, even more, of a sudden descent, as in dive bombing. Yet many of these problems have been solved satisfactorily in the short span of about 25 years.

Franklin C. McLean attempts to console us that chemical warfare is not any more "terrible and inhumane" than any

other form of warfare, and he cites none other than Haldane to support his view. The reason the Germans didn't use "poison gas" over England in 1940 and at Stalingrad in 1942 was not that such warfare was inhuman, but rather because it was less effective than other forms of warfare. Of course, the question of retaliation was not forgotten.

S. H. ROSENBLOOM, M.D.

Germany and Europe, by Benedetto Croce. Translated and with an Introduction by Vincent Sheean. New York: Random House. 83 pages. \$1.25.

This little work is at once another of the "what to do with Germany after the war" books and an *apologia pro vita sua* by the distinguished Italian philosopher. A twenty-four page introduction by Vincent Sheean, rather naively subtitled "unnecessary for those who already know Croce's work," reveals Sheean as an amateur convert to the Philosophy of Spirit. Sheean also seeks to give Croce a clean bill of health with respect to the spiritual pest-house diseases which surrounded the philosopher during the long night of Fascism. Though Croce's role during the twenty years of Fascist rule was not altogether impeccable—he did not oppose it at first; perhaps, as Sheean says, he did not understand it—yet he remained aloof and was perhaps the only free mind in Italy during Mussolini's reign. Perhaps his prestige put him beyond Mussolini's wrath; in any case, few read his books and fewer understood them.

The body of this little work is made up of four essays, the first written for this edition, the second dated 1936, and the others during the winter of 1943. The first essay: "Confessions of an Italian Germanophile" who cannot discover in himself anything for which he should repent, presents Croce's defense against any imputation that he might have been pro-Nazi because of his earlier Germanophilism. He defends his coolness toward the allied cause in the last war, asserts that he was righteously indignant then with respect to the lies and calumny spread concerning the older Germany, and still believes that the peace of Versailles erred on the side of harshness. His attitude toward Germany changed with the rise of the Nazis, but he regards Nazism as a fundamental departure from the basic traditions of the German peo-

ple. This seems a somewhat strange conclusion for a philosopher of history since the historical attitude sees the present as the child of the past. One might also expect that Croce would review his earlier attitudes toward the German in the last war in the light of the realities of this one.

One of the most valuable things in the book is the long quotation from an unnamed German scholar who shows a most "un-German" spirit of critical objectivity with respect to his own nation. This German asserts that his fatherland lacks the qualities necessary for governing others and asserts that it must instead be governed. He explains this defect in his people as due to their betrayal by nature and history, and finds three almost organic deficiencies in the Germans (pp. 43-4):

In its cerebral structure metaphysical thought prevails so greatly and with such force of suggestion, that it works almost with the primordial energy of passion; this inevitably leads to criminal fanaticism if it is not anchored in the depths of nature.

History has furthermore done the German people the grave wrong of sparing it up to the present time the experience of a long and hard serfdom under the heel of a foreigner—an experience from which are born the idea of liberty and the sense of need for it. . . .

The third deficiency, the most desperate of all, was the result of the battle between Arminius and Varus in 9 B. C.: of that battle which decided the Romans to renounce forever the Romanization of Germany, abandoning that country to itself. . . . This led to the exclusion of the Germans from the western commonality of culture and is the source of the eternal complaint of the Germans that they are misunderstood.

Croce sees that the Nazis sought to conduct all others not to a higher civilization by means of higher ideas, but to enslave them to a brute power devoid of all ideas, unless the slogan of "Aryanism" be called an idea. But he also deplores the present tendency to put the Aryan theory on its head, i.e., to use it in reverse, and to make of the Germans a people outside of history and humanity, irreducible to the former and irredeemable for the latter. Since, he asserts, the dissension between Germany and Europe has been called forth by history, the dissension must be composed by history. He then advocates a post war treatment of Germany which will move from "rigor to indulgence, from exclusion to collaboration, from severity to cordiality and from conflict to conciliation." He is confident that the second world holocaust is

the necessary purgative which will cleanse the German people of their barbarism and butchery, that the shame which they cannot help but feel over the evil for which they have made themselves the instrument "will be converted into a force for good—as with those great saints who were once great sinners."

There is a nobility in Croce's writing when he does not descend to personal apologia, and his writing glows with a warm intensity when he envisages the ultimate harmony of the cohabitation of peoples. But some of his readers may distrust his pious conviction that Germany will be cured by its need for inner regeneration. Perhaps the Germans need to live under the heel of a foreign conqueror in order to develop a love for liberty.

LIONEL RUBY

Russia and the Peace, by Bernard Pares. The Macmillan Company. 293 pp. Xi. \$2.50.

It is, I imagine, universally agreed that the problem of peace at the conclusion of this war cannot be satisfactorily and durably solved without the participation of the major powers. Of these the United States, Great Britain, and Russia are of course the most important ones. Without friendly cooperation between these Powers it is hard to imagine any real lasting peace.

Now frankly what are the chances? It is useless to deny that many are of the opinion that cooperation with Russia will prove very difficult. Extreme adherents of this view would have us prepare for another war, this time against the Soviet Union, within the next ten to twenty years at the most. Others, less pessimistic, believe that Russia herself will become increasingly self-sufficient and isolationist, letting the rest of the world get along as best it can.

The author of the book under review, Sir Bernard Pares, quite on the contrary, is an ardent believer in the feasibility and necessity of friendly cooperation with Russia. A life-long student of Russia and the Russians, his opinion carries considerable weight. There are few writers on Russia who have known that country so long and so well as he. He had many intimate friends belonging to all shades of political opinion in pre-revolutionary Russia. For years he was firmly convinced that the liberal forces of Russia

would succeed in safely guiding the country onto the path of constitutional democracy. The course of the Russian revolution was at first undoubtedly a bitter blow to him, as it cut short promising beginnings along those lines. In the years of the civil war he did his best to further the cause of the Allies and to restrain the danger of German influence. For years after the end of the civil war he was greatly out of sympathy with the theories and practices of the Communist regime. As he himself vividly tells, he was strongly opposed to the extension of Communist propaganda into Great Britain. In fact, he considers the period from 1920 to about 1927 one in which Russia was still actively promoting the cause of World Revolution. He believes that at the end of that period—that is, after Stalin's victory over Trotsky—a new era began for Russia. This was the era of the development of the country's resources, of the development of all its immense potentialities. From that time on, in his opinion, each year marked a further and further retreat from the World Revolution ideas of the Comintern.

Sir Bernard believes that the Allies themselves with their policy of appeasement were largely responsible for the failure of the negotiations with Russia during the earlier part of 1939. A patriotic Englishman, he has a profound feeling of gratitude for Russia when, by her splendid resistance to the German attack in 1941, she did so much to relieve the dire stress in which England had been placed. He is convinced that after the war Stalin will turn first of all to the healing of his country's wounds and then to the further development of its resources. The United States and Great Britain have nothing to fear from the Soviet state provided that they keep to a policy of friendly cooperation.

In some minor ways the author has criticisms to offer. He points out very justly that the Soviet government has for a long time, and is still, maintaining an attitude of suspicion and distrust towards all foreigners, no matter how friendly. The case of foreign correspondents and their difficulties is well known and has been only recently aired again. Sir Bernard tells us of his own failure to organize facilities for English and American students to study in Russia. He hopes for a favorable solution of this

question in the future, but points out that for the present the Soviet government itself is at least somewhat to blame for the attitude of suspicion and mistrust that exists in many quarters.

The book is written in a most vivid and compelling style. An admirable teacher, Sir Bernard has certainly the gift of inculcating enthusiasm in his readers. It is the strength of his enthusiasm that forces us at times to question the validity of some of his conclusions, and to ask ourselves the question, "Isn't the author a bit carried away by his ardent faith?" One finds it difficult to disagree with Pares in his hopes, even though one might envisage many trials and tribulations on the road to the state of complete understanding between Russia and the great Western democracies.

GEORGE BOBRINSKOY

In the Steps of Moses, by Louis Golding. The Jewish Publication Society of America. 556 pp. \$2.50.

When Louis Golding was a little boy in Manchester, England, reared by pious parents, he often dreamt of the Orient: "Zion seemed a day's journey around the corner," he said, retrospectively, in his autobiography, *The World I Knew*. He was in his early forties when, in 1937, accompanied by two non-Jewish Englishmen, he followed in the steps of Moses on a route about the Peninsula of Sinai and ended at length on the border of the Promised Land." The fruit of the journey, made in a Ford motorcar and on the back of a camel, were two books: *In the Steps of Moses the Lawgiver*, describing the trip to Mount Sinai, and *In the Steps of Moses the Conqueror*, carrying the story to its end in the land of Moab where Moses died—according to tradition—without having entered the land which the Lord gave to the children of Israel.

The present volume is a condensation of the two books, and it is being issued at a time when the interest in Biblical topics seems to have re-awakened (see the recent flood of books on Moses, Joshua, David, and other Biblical personalities). Golding's book is no biography of Moses, though, despite the fact that we feel his presence throughout the book, even when the author deals with trivial things, as he often does. It will thrill those who wonder how the Bible

regions look today and who wish to acquire some historical, folkloristic, and archeological knowledge without headache. With the help of modern excavations as well as the Talmudic lore and Jewish tradition the erudite author tries to identify the Pharaoh who suppressed the Israelites, the birth-place of Moses, and the seat of the palace where he was reared as an Egyptian prince—and if his solutions of the many other riddles of a similar nature does not quite satisfy the critical reader, it is certainly fun to pretend having found the answers. Even where he discusses problems which have been worrying scholars of all lands for many centuries, Golding doesn't worry at all, and he never abandons his pleasantly journalistic style which occasionally makes thrilling reading (for instance, in his description of Sinai and the ascent to the Mountain of God). Besides Moses, incidentally, another man is now haunting the deserts crossed by Golding and his companions: Lawrence of Arabia who fought his battles on the same terrain as the son of Amram and Jochebed. In Transjordan, near the conclusion of his journey, Golding would have been killed by hostile Arabs had they found out that he was Jewish.

The volume is neatly printed and furnished with two maps and sixteen impressive photographs.

ALFRED WERNER

Phantom Victory, by Ervin Lessner, G. B. Putnam's Sons, 227 pp. \$2.50.

It is the year 1945; the action of the combined armies of the Allies, relentless bombing of German cities, and brilliant military strategy compel the Nazis into imminent surrender; defeat is inevitable. The Allied High Command prepares to meet the Germans to impose its terms. There is, however, no responsible German leadership to deal with; Hitler and other notorious murderers vanish and hordes of German soldiers, disarmed, stony-faced, silent, stripped to the waist, march over the German countryside passively resistant of Allied demands to reveal the whereabouts of their military leaders or to cooperate in post-war adjustments. Dismayed and uncertain of a situation they did not anticipate, the Allies confront eventually a Potsdam-Bund, an aggregation of German leaders who claim some influence within the nation

but who refuse to be treated as parties immediately responsible for the war and who ask to be taken only as consultants in solving the problems of their people.

This, in brief, is Lessner's introduction to his allegedly prophetic novel of a "peace-time" Germany of the Fourth Reich, at the conclusion of World War Number II. Allied commissions organized to try and punish criminals, retrieve loot from the clutches of the barbarians, dismantle Nazi factories, reorganize German industries, levy contributions, change the internal structure of Nazidom—all meet a blank wall of deceit, non-cooperation, and a nation which in defeat, because it is disciplined and led by forces unknown to its victors, is stronger than its conquerors.

A new leader emerges from the fastness of the German forests and mountains—one Friedolin, a young blond God who calls himself a meek shepherd of a penitent flock—the Germans—and whose title instead of Fuehrer is the Chief Warden of the Penitents. He, too, like Hitler, hears voices, becomes a living deity over night, and captures both the imagination and worship of his people. He preaches "penitence" which is never defined in substance, speaks to the German people through stooges who are really his masters, and exacts absolute obedience from the masses.

The Allies, tired of the sacrifices of a devastating war, with the conflict of Japan still in full blast, fully occupied with their own domestic problems conceive of no solutions of the German puzzle. There begins a series of compromises because the Allies need the highly valuable German technical help in all fields of industry. Friedolin takes advantage of the indecision of the Allies, their need of weapons and trained workers neither of which, in the telling of the author, is somehow available in England, the United States, and elsewhere. In this he is assisted by the advocates of a "soft" peace with the Germans, sentimentalists, isolationists, a predatory press all over the world and the colossal stupidity of the leadership of the Allies which refuses to heed the lessons of perennial German duplicity.

Friedolin, the Chief Warden of the Penitents, despite his preoccupation with the voices in the German forests, succeeds with the help of fifth columnists, new and former saboteurs, and the exi-

gencies of post-war crises in allied countries to exact enormous advantages from the conquerors of the Third Reich. The Allies practice appeasement on a scale that dwarfs the machinations of the Cliveden sets and pusillanimous Chamberlain. Germany waxes stronger while the Allies grow weak; here and there emerges a Nazi gangster of Hitler's vintage, under an assumed name but as vicious and menacing as of old; Hitler is nowhere but his handiwork is apparent. As the years roll on a new Germany by manipulation, deceit, and murder compels the smaller nations into the orbit of its influence.

Russia, according to the author, emasculated by the ineptitude of its leadership, lack of efficiency and inability to master her post-war problems suffers from hunger and unemployment and becomes a chattel of the Fourth Reich. Great Britain, attacked in her colonies in India, Africa and Asia and eventually by a brilliant coup in the heart of England, is laid low. The United States is invaded through Mexico which joins Argentine and other fascist South American republics. Friedolin's last appearance is in the harbor of New York where, accompanied by the indestructible paper-hanger, he delivers himself of a tirade the gist of which is that the Herrenvolk will always prevail and that murder pays.

But fifteen years pass—1945-1960—before the curtain falls on this, the final act of Lessner's tragedy. Fantastic as the story is, it makes unusually depressing reading; inconceivable as it may be that upon the conclusion of this war the Allies *may not insist* that Germany be stripped of the slightest means of waging another war, the fact remains that cheap sentimentality, short sightedness, and diverse nefarious elements will still be with us, and some of these will have their elbows on the peace table when the last show-down with the gas chamber experts takes place.

Phantom Victory, in spite of the obvious efforts of the author to oversimplify the developments of the international scene to make a point, is an extremely useful book. It is a satire on the forthcoming leadership and the sagacity of the Allies. It is, truly, a prophetic warning of what may come to pass if a defeated Germany is trusted further than you may toss a modern battleship with one hand.

BENJAMIN WEINTROUB

Group Relations & Group Antagonisms.

A series of addresses and discussions. Religion and civilization series. Edited by R. M. MacIver. Published by the Institute for Religious Studies, and distributed by Harper and Brothers, New York and London, 1944. Pp. vii, 237. \$2.00.

This is the first publication of the Institute for Religious Studies which has very largely been the brainchild of the President of Jewish Theological Seminary, Dr. Louis Finkelstein. The Editor is one of the most distinguished American sociologists, Professor R. M. MacIver of Barnard College and Columbia University. The book contains a series of addresses and discussions on group relations and group antagonisms, both in the United States and in the world at large, which took place within the framework of the Institute for Religious Studies under Professor MacIver's chairmanship.

The content is divided into two parts. Part one deals with minority, nationality, ethnic, and religious groups in the United States; part two with minority groups in the world order. Part one opens with a very thoughtful contribution by Professor MacIver on group images and group realities, dealing with the fundamental truth of inter-group relations, namely that the images which we have of one another and the corresponding realities do not coincide. Professor MacIver could have added that not only do we have a distorted image about others but likewise about ourselves.

Among the following factual contributions, on Eastern European nationality and ethnic groups, the Italian-Americans, the Negro group, and the Chinese in the United States, I find Max Ascoli's contribution about the Italian-Americans especially worth reading because of its realistic attitude in distributing the lights and shadows in the picture. Professor Locke's paper on the Negro is fortunate in lacking the militancy which one finds in the utterances of other Negro leaders. It is, however, much more apologetic than Professor Ascoli's contribution. Mr. Lin's discussion of the mutual misconceptions between Chinese and Americans keeps well within Professor MacIver's introductory framework. Professor Deak's paper on Eastern European minorities would seem to me to be the weakest of

the papers presented in this group. I can hardly imagine a Hungarian having an intimate knowledge of Slavic peoples; he certainly does not even mention the four million East-European Jews that came to this country. Also the fact that he appears to think that Polish food has preserved the Polish group rather than the Polish group having preserved Polish food habits, does not indicate a particularly subtle insight into the processes which enter into the evolution of group consciousness.

Finally, it should be said that one misses in this section a discussion of at least four or five fundamental American minority problems. One would be the problem of the Japanese-Americans which has become something like a test-case of American democracy; the second would be the problem of the German-Americans, which is unfortunately muted at the present moment in spite of the fact that the Germans constitute the oldest, the largest, the most diversified, and in many ways the most persistent of our ethnic minority groups; the third would be the problem of the American Indian, perhaps in conjunction with, perhaps separate from, the problem of the Mexican minority in the United States; the fourth and fifth would be the problem of the French-Canadians in this country as well as in Canada and the problem of self-government for Puerto Rico, both of which approach a European nationality problem most nearly among all American minority problems.

The second half of part one is devoted to the problems of religious minorities. There are three contributions, one by President Shuster of Hunter College on the Roman Catholic minority, one by Rabbi Louis Finkelstein on the Jewish minority, and one which is especially meritorious on the Society of Friends, delivered by Professor Steere. All three contributions are quite thought-provoking. Jewish readers should be especially interested in President Shuster's courageous challenge to the materialistic trends in our civilization. This challenge, if it were really to have an effective following among the Catholic laity, would make the Catholic minority the foremost and truest minority in the United States. However, all three contributions are lacking in a sociological approach which would make them comparable to the preceding papers on ethnic groups. This must be said es-

pecially with regard to Rabbi Finkelstein's otherwise brilliant treatment of the Jewish minority. It is, like Mr. Shuster's paper just a little bit too metaphysical, just a little bit too reluctant to consider the widely diversified sub-groups within the major group, just a little bit too aloof from the social and economic frictions which the Jewish group encounters in this country as well as in other countries. In short, the Jewish group may be treated as a religious group; but it should be treated as an ethnic group as well. Similarly, the Society of Friends, as any other sectarian group, cannot be treated realistically if the factor of inbreeding and quasi-biological group formation is not dealt with along with the more ideological problems. The foremost example in this respect would be offered by the community of the Mormons.

The report on part two can be much shorter than the report on part one because all the contributions presented in this part are unquestionably excellent. This is true of Stewart G. Cole's objective report on Europe's conflict of cultures, of Oscar J. Janowsky's impassioned yet still balanced plea for ethnic and cultural minorities, of Frank Tannenbaum's glittering *aperçu* on the complicated problems of minorities in Latin America, of Jacob Robinson's many-sided treatment of the Soviet solution of the minorities problem (which is by far the best treatment of this most controversial topic which I have thus far seen), and even of Krishnalal's Shridaran's emotional and idealistic report on minorities and the autonomy of India. That three of these fine contributions come from Jews (by the way, Mr. Ascoli also is of Jewish descent), may be a cause of satisfaction to the Jewish reader; moreover, Mr. Janowsky's and Mr. Robinson's papers are written with the Jewish side of their respective problems well in mind. However, it should be added that the Jewish reader misses here a discussion of the problems of the Near East, especially of Jewish-Arab relations in Palestine. The very severe minority (or rather majority) problems in South and East Africa should likewise

not have been omitted. The book closes with an excellent "summation" from Professor MacIver.

Professor MacIver's chairmanship and editorship guarantees that the book combines smooth reading with profound treatment. It is one of the few books on group relations that leaves the attentive reader definitely wiser than he was before. The various chapters offer excellent material for sincere discussion in youth groups, women's clubs, lodges, and congregations.

WERNER J. CAHNMAN

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, etc., of THE CHICAGO JEWISH FORUM, published quarterly at Chicago, Illinois, for October 1, 1944. Required by the Act of Congress August 24, 1912.

Before me a notary public, in and for the State and county aforesaid, personally appeared BENJAMIN WEINTROUB, who, having been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that he is the owner, editor and publisher of THE CHICAGO JEWISH FORUM, and that the following is, to the best of his knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management (and if a daily paper, the circulation), etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the Act of August 24, 1912, as amended by the Act of March 3, 1933, embodied in section 537, Postal Laws and Regulations.

That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor and business manager are: Publisher—Benjamin Weintroub, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago 3, Ill. Editor—Benjamin Weintroub. Managing Editor—none. Business Manager—none.

That the owner is: (If owned by a corporation, its name and address must be stated and also immediately thereunder the names and addresses of stockholders owning one per cent or more of total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, the names and addresses of the individual owners must be given. If owned by a firm, or other unincorporated concern, its name and address, as well as those of each individual member, must be given.) Benjamin Weintroub, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago 3, Illinois.

There are no bondholders, mortgagees, or other security holders.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 1st day of October, 1944.

(Signed) BENJAMIN WEINTROUB

(Signed) Susan Ehrlich, Notary Public.

My Commission Expires June 21st, 1946.

